



✓ read

✓ 1222

# THE BOOK OF PSALMS

VOL. I.





THE  
BOOK OF PSALMS

*Translated from a revised text with  
Notes and Introduction*

IN PLACE OF A SECOND EDITION OF AN EARLIER  
WORK (1888) BY THE SAME AUTHOR

BY

T. K. CHEYNE, D.LITT., D.D.

ORIEL PROFESSOR OF THE INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IN THE UNIVERSITY  
OF OXFORD, AND CANON OF ROCHESTER

*IN TWO VOLUMES*

VOL. I.

LONDON  
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., LTD.  
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET, W.

1904

18. Search for redactional mosaic work (Briggs and Peters). Ra-  
criticism of the text a necessary preliminary.
19. Prospect of large reconstruction of current theories. Suggestive  
impatient readers.
20. A sheaf of critical remarks for the more patient reader. i. (C  
phon in lxxii. 20. ii. The title, 'Of Jerahmeel-ashhur.' iii. 'S  
of Degrees;' bearing of the revised title. iv. The 'Mich  
(*'Maacathim'*) psalms.
21. v. The Elohistic Psalter—its true significance.
22. vi. Relation of the 'Chronicles' to the Psalter.
23. vii. Maccabean psalms.
24. 'Psalms of Solomon.' True significance and relation to canon  
psalms.
25. Controversy as to the 'I' psalms; bearing of the 'Psalms  
Solomon' on this matter.
26. Poetical form of psalms. Metre; strophes.
27. Treatment of the text in this edition.  
Concluding Notice (pp. lxx. f.).  
Abbreviations (pp. lxxii. f.).  
Corrigenda and Addenda (pp. lxxiv.—lxxx.).

TO PROFESSOR HERMANN GUNKEL,  
AN ABLE AND ORIGINAL SCHOLAR OF THE YOUNGER GENERATION,  
WHO, WITHOUT MINIMIZING HIS DEBT TO THE PAST,  
IS FAITHFUL TO NEW LIGHT,  
AND USES IT FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF NEW PROBLEMS,  
THIS ATTEMPT TO BREAK FRESH GROUND  
FOR THE STUDENTS OF JEWISH HISTORY AND RELIGION  
IS CORDIALLY DEDICATED.

18. Search for redactional mosaic work (Briggs and Peters). Rational criticism of the text a necessary preliminary.

19. Prospect of large reconstruction of current theories. impatient readers.

of critical remarks for the more patient reader. i. (ii. The title, 'Of Jerahmeel-ashhur.' iii. 'S'; bearing of the revised title. iv. The 'Mich

21. v. The Elohistic Psalter—its true significance.

22. vi. Relation of the 'Chronicler' to the Psalter.

23. vii. Maccabean psalms.

24. 'Psalms of Solomon.' True significance and relation to canon psalms.

25. Controversy as to the 'I' psalms; bearing of the 'Psalms Solomon' on this matter.

26. Poetical form of psalms. Metre; strophes.

27. Treatment of the text in this edition.

Concluding Notice (pp. lxx. f.).

Abbreviations (pp. lxxii. f.).

Corrigenda and Addenda (pp. lxxiv.—lxxx.).

## INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE ambition of the interpreter of the Old Testament is to study the religious contents of the old Jewish writings in their several strata, with a view to tracing the converging lines of a real and not merely theoretical development of ideas and beliefs, and with all the help that the investigation of Semitic antiquity, of the comparative psychology of peoples, and of anthropology can supply. And to his study of these ideas and beliefs, which sometimes present themselves in unfamiliar forms, he must bring, not the detached spirit of an anatomist, or of a visitor from another planet, but the sympathy born of the consciousness that the essentials of religion are permanent, and that modern thoughts and beliefs may often be folded up in ancient germs. This goal was present to the mind of the present writer, when he wrote the two works entitled *The Book of Psalms, or, The Praises of Israel* (1888), and especially *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions* (1891).

It is necessary that such books as the Bampton Lectures for 1889 should from time to time be written, and it may be hoped that when the next attempt is made to treat of the important theme of that work, it may be possible to bring out the historical development of the higher Israelitish religion, and its points of contact with other religions, more fully and accurately. But just because the object is so high and the work so arduous, it is one's duty to listen to those voices which call us back for a time to incompletely performed preliminary tasks. In order that the exegesis of the Psalter and the historical illumination of the results of that exegesis may progress, it is urgently necessary to give a keener and more methodical examination to the traditional text. Far be it from me to underrate the value



## CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION, ETC.

1. The expanded view of our object as students of the O.T. makes it the more necessary to test our foundations. The author's conclusion ; the two Psalters, both historically important.
2. Attempt to do justice to the traditional text (LXX. and Massoretic text) which represents the 'newer Psalter.'
3. A revision of the text required, both from a practical and from a critical point of view.
4. The good which will result from it for the comprehension of the psalmists and of Biblical religion.
5. Special benefit to the later history of Israel. The N. Arabian theory. Muşri and the Negeb.
6. The N. Arabian references in the psalms sometimes real, sometimes partly imaginative.
7. Are there any psalms which were composed in the Negeb ?
8. Influences which promoted a healthy religious development in spite of 'the N. Arabian danger.' Receptivity of the Jews. Historical value of the newer Psalter. Neither Psalter primarily a record of theology.
9. The N. Arabian oppression—its extent. Record of it in the Psalms.
10. Summary of contents of Psalter, showing the historical colouring.
11. How to begin the study of this book. Specimen psalms for the new background. Royal psalms. Psalms of immortality.
12. Study of the titles of the Psalms (and of the term Selah). Hopelessness of the problems, while the traditional text supplies the basis.
13. New attitude towards the problems ; new solutions.
14. Historical references appended to the titles.
15. True cause of the traditional assignment of so many pious songs to David. Jeduthun.
16. Grounds on which pre-exilic psalms are still assumed. Kautzsch.



17. Prof. Briggs on the study of the Minor Psalters. Modification of plan suggested.
18. Search for redactional mosaic work (Briggs and Peters). Radical criticism of the text a necessary preliminary.
19. Prospect of large reconstruction of current theories. Suggestion to impatient readers.
20. A sheaf of critical remarks for the more patient reader. i. Colophon in lxxii. 20. ii. The title, 'Of Jerahmeel-ashhur.' iii. 'Songs of Degrees;' bearing of the revised title. iv. The 'Michtam' ('Maacathim') psalms.
21. v. The Elohistie Psalter—its true significance.
22. vi. Relation of the 'Chronicler' to the Psalter.
23. vii. Maccabæan psalms.
24. 'Psalms of Solomon.' True significance and relation to canonical psalms.
25. Controversy as to the 'I' psalms; bearing of the 'Psalms of Solomon' on this matter.
26. Poetical form of psalms. Metre; strophes.
27. Treatment of the text in this edition.  
 Concluding Notice (pp. lxx. f.).  
 Abbreviations (pp. lxxii. f.).  
 Corrigenda and Addenda (pp. lxxiv.—lxxx.).

## INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE ambition of the interpreter of the Old Testament is to study the religious contents of the old Jewish writings in their several strata, with a view to tracing the converging lines of a real and not merely theoretical development of ideas and beliefs, and with all the help that the investigation of Semitic antiquity, of the comparative psychology of peoples, and of anthropology can supply. And to his study of these ideas and beliefs, which sometimes present themselves in unfamiliar forms, he must bring, not the detached spirit of an anatomist, or of a visitor from another planet, but the sympathy born of the consciousness that the essentials of religion are permanent, and that modern thoughts and beliefs may often be folded up in ancient germs. This goal was present to the mind of the present writer, when he wrote the two works entitled *The Book of Psalms, or, The Praises of Israel* (1888), and especially *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions* (1891).

It is necessary that such books as the Bampton Lectures for 1889 should from time to time be written, and it may be hoped that when the next attempt is made to treat of the important theme of that work, it may be possible to bring out the historical development of the higher Israelitish religion, and its points of contact with other religions, more fully and accurately. But just because the object is so high and the work so arduous, it is one's duty to listen to those voices which call us back for a time to incompletely performed preliminary tasks. In order that the exegesis of the Psalter and the historical illumination of the results of that exegesis may progress, it is urgently necessary to give a keener and more methodical examination to the traditional text. Far be it from me to underrate the value

of that earlier criticism, in which it has been my privilege to participate. But I cannot close myself to the conviction that the old methods have done nearly all that they are capable of doing, and that virtually new methods<sup>1</sup> must be superadded to the old.

I venture at this point to offer a caution to the reader, viz. that if he wishes to comprehend and to do justice to the present attempt, he must study it in the first instance from the author's point of view. It is obvious that any philological work, if criticized from an alien point of view, will appear full of faults, and, if praised at all, will be praised for things which represent the author's inconsistencies and hesitations. Hence the fair-minded reader who is anticipated here will naturally begin by acquainting himself with the conclusion at which the author arrives. The novelty of this conclusion may perhaps put a strain on the reader's patience—for it touches the foundations of Israelitish history, but it may be hoped that he will be compensated for this by gaining some fresh insight into the higher Israelitish religion. Wonderful, indeed, and yet—when closely studied—most natural is the story of the growth of that religion, and we may confidently expect that by unfolding its own secret, the Psalter will throw fresh light on some obscure parts of that story. This is, in fact, as I have often told my readers, my own chief interest, and it appears to me that my present conclusion, bold as it may seem, will be helpful in bringing about this result. That conclusion is briefly this—that we have in our hands, closely but not inseparably united, two Psalters—a newer and an older. The newer is preserved in two chief forms—the Greek of the LXX. and the Massoretic Hebrew text. Both these represent independent recensions of the text,<sup>2</sup> and underneath both it is still possible, sometimes with more, sometimes with less confidence in the smaller details, to recognize an earlier text of the psalms, which approaches the form which they received from the writers or from the earliest editors.

§ 2. Let an attempt first be made to do full justice to the traditional text, represented alike by the LXX. and by the

<sup>1</sup> See the Prologue to *Critica Biblica*, Part i., and the article, 'Pressing Needs of Old Testament Study,' in the *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Kittel, *Ueber die Notwendigkeit u. Möglichkeit einer neuen Ausgabe der Hebräischen Bibel* (1902), p. 44.

Massoretic recension. The interest of a great textual tradition, whether Sanskrit or Hebrew, is as fascinating as it is manifold. Who, for instance, can take up any important work on Genesis or Samuel or the Psalms, and fail to observe what curious and difficult problems have been suggested by the tradition? Even when the problems have their origin in critically doubtful readings, they have given invaluable stimulus to philologists, and have set them on fruitful tracks of inquiry, the end whereof is in many cases not yet seen. And who can study the current introductions to 'Biblical Theology' without noticing how largely the authors have drawn upon the Psalter, mainly in its traditional form, as an authority for the religion of the early Judaism?<sup>1</sup>

Nor is this the only point of view from which the importance of the existing Psalter, and its claim upon the students, may be willingly recognized. Let it be granted that the text has often been injured by the operation of the manifold causes of corruption, and recast by ingenious editors. Still the fact that some at least of the psalms revised by these editors (*e.g.* Pss. xc., cxxxix.) contain passages in highly impressive diction, which have helped to mould the inner life of countless saints of Church and Synagogue, may well make us hesitate to treat such an influential work as unworthy of critical study. Some sense must have been put even upon those collocations of letters and words which strike us most by their peculiarity and improbability. What was that sense? Must we not sooner or later acknowledge that in dealing with such passages philological ingenuity and familiarity with the Arabic or Assyrian lexicon are less necessary than a sympathetic comprehension of the feelings and ideas of the later Judaism? In fact, the study of the traditional text cannot be altogether separated from that of the early traditional exegesis. For this exegesis must be the direct offspring of the interpretation put upon the Psalter by the later editors. In spite of its inconsistencies, it is capable of offering some valuable suggestions to the student of the received text.

<sup>1</sup> I refer of course to those ideas and types of belief which are most fully characteristic of the pious Jewish community. This drawing on the Book of Psalms is most conspicuous in Cheyne, *Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter* (1901), and Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttest. Religionsgeschichte* (1st ed., 1893; 2nd, 1899).

Nor is it only the editors of the consonantal text who claim our respect. We have also to do honour to those self-forgetting Jewish scholars who, by continuous efforts, produced the present elaborate vocalization and accentuation. It has been well said that 'none of the old translators, with the exception possibly of the Targumists, . . . has had so clear an insight into the [possible] sense of the text, and has understood it down to its nicest peculiarities in accordance with the traditional reading.'<sup>1</sup> In fact, the pointing of the text has provided us with an unique and admirable record of the view of the grammatical meaning which has been traditional since the Christian era. Well does it deserve the patient and thoughtful study which a succession of modern scholars, notably Eduard König, have given to it, though one may fear that this patient scholarship has sometimes been unconsciously devoted to propping up unsound conclusions.

§ 3. I have now to explain the grounds on which a revision of the text, which some will call 'ruthless,' and others, as I hope, fundamentally reverent, claims a favourable reception. Let me begin from a practical point of view. In spite of the attachment of most English Christians to one or both of the two old versions of the Psalms which are still current, it is doubtful how much longer educated persons will be satisfied with this. They may of course continue to admire the rhythmic flow of the old versions, and to use them for devotional purposes, because of the trains of thought which many finely expressed passages suggest. But surely such persons cannot help desiring a greater degree of insight into the original meaning of the Psalms than either of these versions can give. The Old Testament as a literature is rapidly taking its place as a historical and literary as well as religious monument of antiquity, and what would the Old Testament be without the Psalter? Now, in spite of the much-improved grammars and lexicons which exist, it can very easily be shown that the words of the Psalms in the traditional text often admit only of a forced translation, and that the supposed connexion of the sentences is often illusory. If so, the historical and literary students of the future will not be satisfied either with an old version or with any existing or prospective revision of it, or even

<sup>1</sup> Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, Eng. Transl. (1892), p. 236; cp. Wellhausen, in Bleek's *Einleitung in das A. T.*, 4th ed. (1878), p. 616.

with a perfectly new version based, or partly based, upon the traditional text. The version that they will need is one that represents a thoroughly revised Hebrew text. It may be far from satisfying a purely æsthetic criticism. It may also run counter to many theological prejudices. But in the light of history it will be intelligible and interesting, and it may well be that the scholars whose critical work renders such a version possible may bring to light some moral and spiritual beauties which had been lost for centuries.

Next, from a purely critical point of view. Great as is our debt to the Massoretic scholars, to the LXX. translators, and to the editors of the Hebrew text who preceded them, we must be under no illusion as to the character of the traditional text. The Old Testament is not altogether in its original form; it has undergone not merely corruption, but editorial manipulation. This is plainer in some books than in others, but nowhere perhaps is it more manifest than in the Psalter. Hence the question before us is, whether we prefer the uncritical conjectures of late editors or those which are suggested by the application of critical methods. Very many passages, as I have said already, admit only of a strained interpretation. Indeed, we may go even further, and assert that on grammatical, lexicographical, and exegetical grounds they are self-evidently corrupt, and that any appearance of plausibility which they may possess is simply due to the skill of an early editor, who, in the interests of edification, applied a well-meaning violence to the unpromising material before him.

The methodical, but (in its range) too limited criticism of the past century has no doubt had some apparent success, but the appearance is too often fallacious. Such a thorough and almost terribly frank critic as Duhm again and again admits this, and my chief complaint of this scholar is that he is not searching enough in his criticism, and speaks of a psalmist with a painful vehemence which would often only be justifiable if he had shown that the received text was what the psalmist wrote. Earnestly do I hope that one result of the present work may be to induce some critics to question whether a strictly 'moderate' textual criticism is really as desirable as they have supposed.

§ 4. Other good results which may be hoped for relate to the ideas, feelings, and aspirations of the psalmists. Were they, for instance, as a body, quite as fiercely vindictive as we have imagined? This may well be doubted. It is true, Ps. cix. must always remain

vindictive, but the text which sound critical method seems to require is at any rate without the worst and the least excusable of the imprecations (see vol. ii., p. 139). And if I am not mistaken, we shall be led to recognize that the highest reason why some of the psalmists wished the peoples hostile to Israel to be severely punished, was that Yahwè might have the glory of pardoning even the deepest iniquity through the repentance and conversion of some part at least of the offending peoples (see Ps. ii., ll. 23-27 ; xviii., ll. 101-104 ; lix., ll. 33-36). It is in harmony with this that the repentant survivors from the judgment on N. Arabia appears to be sometimes, by anticipation, called upon to join in Israel's songs of praise (see e.g. xxix., xcvi.-xcviii., ciii., cxxxviii.). This milder and more humane tone seems to be not infrequent in the latter part of the Psalter. One psalmist indeed (see Ps. lxxxvii.) even appears to have anticipated that a number of N. Arabians hitherto known as Asshurites, Rehobites, and Jerahmeelites would be adopted into the family or community of Zion or Israel—a very similar prospect to that which is held out at the end of Isa. xix. And still more surprising is the disclosure made in Ps. xcix., according to the revised text. For here it is stated (vol. ii., pp. 103 f.) that some of the N. Arabians will not only learn to call upon Yahwè and observe his law, but will be admitted among his priests. I may venture to illustrate this by the statement which, as I have shown elsewhere (see *Crit. Bib.*, p. 49), is probably made in one of the latest parts of the Book of Isaiah (Isa. lxvi. 21). Perhaps if Richard Hooker could have shared these conclusions, he might have been still more inclined to mention 'heroical magnanimity' as one of the qualities displayed by 'David.' I must confess, however, that even so the assignment of such a quality can hardly be quite justified ; 'humility' (towards God), not 'magnanimity,' was regarded by the Jews as the queen of the virtues. But it may at least be affirmed that a sense of the bond of humanity was beginning to spring up among some of the authors of the great Jewish Book of Common Prayer and Praise.

It would carry me too far to draw out here in detail all the results which appear to follow for Biblical religion from the revised text. I may, however, point (a) to a very probable result of the new study here given to Pss. xlv., lxxii., and ci., viz. that the personal Messianic hope—so dear to us by its connection with the preaching of the Gospel—had not much vigour or vitality in

the circles represented by the psalmists; (*b*) to a result of the new study of Pss. xi., xxxvi.<sup>(1)</sup>, xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup>, lxxiii., lxxvii.<sup>(1)</sup>, xciv.<sup>(1)</sup>, cxvi., which awakens a keen sense of the identity of human nature in East and West, viz. that not only wise men like the writer of the colloquies of 'Job,' but also ordinary pious temple-worshippers were liable to be carried away by a temptation to scepticism<sup>1</sup>; (*c*) to the new light thrown on Ps. xlix., as representing a reaction against the tendency to 'deny' God, with which passages in the two little catechisms (so calm and inoffensive in the traditional text) which form the kernels of Pss. xv. and xxiv.<sup>(1)</sup>; and (*d*) to the decisive judgment which can now be given on the question of the hope of immortality in the Psalter (see on Pss. xvi., xvii., xlix., lxxiii.).

§ 5. It is, however, the history of Israel in the post-exilic period which promises to gain most from these researches. And this is only due in part to a more methodical textual criticism. Important as the virtually new text-critical methods, when superadded to the old, may be, it is not less necessary from time to time to accept suggestions as to the application of these methods from a recent historical theory which, plainly enough, has a great future before it. I refer, of course, to the theory (proved by those Old Testament passages in which the occurrence of מְצֻרִים and מְצֻר, of כּוּשׁ or כּוּשִׁים or כּוּשִׁי, of אֲשֻׁר or אֲשֻׁרִים or אֲשֻׁרִי, and of יִרְחָמָאֵל or אֲרָם—or at any rate of the two former groups of names—as designations of N. Arabian regions or peoples adjoining the land or people of Israel and closely connected with it, is too manifest to be plausibly denied) that some at least of the peoples by which Israel was most directly influenced were those of the N. Arabian border-land. It is only Winckler's unrefuted theory that there was not only a N. Syrian, but also a N. Arabian region called Muṣr or (mât) Muṣri, and his discovery in 1893<sup>2</sup> (which led on naturally to my own subsequent discoveries) of the name Miṣṣor, Miṣsur, or Miṣrim (or perhaps Miṣrām)<sup>3</sup> in a limited number of Old Testament passages, soon increased by himself

<sup>1</sup> Though not in possession of the full evidence for his statement, Prof. Davison was able to say in 1893 that 'the psalmist does not check [questioning] as impious, but with the spirit of true religion, brings his difficulty to God Himself, and pours out his heart in prayer' (*Praises of Israel*, p. 162).

<sup>2</sup> 'Das nordarabische Land Muṣri,' in *Allorient. Forschungen*<sup>(1)</sup>, i., 25 ff.

<sup>3</sup> So Professor Paul Haupt.



and independently by me,<sup>1</sup> to which the discovery of evidence of a region called Cûsh (also mentioned in the Old Testament), was soon added, which could give that sense of security in the textual criticism and in the historical realization of the Psalms, which we must all earnestly desire to possess.

It appears to me superfluous to exhibit here and to discuss at length the evidence for the existence of a N. Arabian kingdom of Muşri, which not improbably extended as far as Yathrib, the modern Medina. When even such a cautious scholar as Dr. Rudolf Kittel admits the fact to be one that 'cannot be argued away,' I do not think that Dr. E. A. W. Budge's contradiction (characterized by an able historical critic, J. V. Prášek, as 'useless vehemence') carries much weight.<sup>2</sup> Winckler himself has so far not found time to reply to the criticisms which have been launched against him, but I know that he contemplates an answer, which will doubtless lose nothing by the delay.<sup>3</sup> Provisionally one may refer any perplexed reader to Prof. H. W. Hogg's remarks in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (col. 4529, note <sup>5</sup>), in which the comparative value of Dr. Budge's arguments is estimated. To me it has long appeared that the only question among open-minded scholars ought to be, how far may we apply this result in explanation or illustration of Old Testament passages?—to which my own answer is, that in a number of cases it is only such an application which enables us to form a clear, intelligible, and consistent historical picture. It must be remembered, however, that the question of the influence of Muşri on S. Palestine is only a part of the larger question of the influence on S. Palestine of N. Arabia, and that Muşri was probably in vassalage to the larger empire of Meluhha, which is frequently referred to in the O.T. writings under the name of Asshur or Ashhur.

<sup>1</sup> Winckler, 'Muşri' ii. (in *Mitteil. der Vorderasiat. Gesellschaft*, 1898, part iv.; Cheyne, *Enc. Biblica*, art. *Mizraim* (written considerably before 1902, the date of its publication); also other articles, e.g. *Exodus*, *The*; *Isaac*; *Kadesh*; *Zarephath*, by Cheyne and S. A. Cook in the latter work. Respectful mention is also due to Fritz Hommel for his suggestions on a 'South Palestinian' Asshur (*Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, pp. 239-246), though his textual criticism is not sufficiently methodical. This ingenious scholar's later suggestions of Biblical references to Moşar, Kôsh, and Ashur (*Aufsätze*, iii. 1, pp. 277 ff.) appeared after my own earlier results, and have not influenced me. The same may be said of Winckler's later suggestions as to the N. Arabian Muşri and Cush in the Old Testament. Independent work may perhaps have an increased claim on the attention of critical students.

<sup>2</sup> See Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, vol. vi., pp. ix.-xxx.; Kittel, article in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xiv. 575 (1903); Prášek, *Sanheribs Feldzüge gegen Juda*, part i., p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> See Winckler in *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1904.

It is assumed in the present work that the deportation of the Jews which has left most traces on the later writings of the Old Testament was, not to Babylonia, but to that part of N. Arabia which was called by the Jews Jerahmeel or the Negeb. It may safely be denied that this region was in antiquity as unproductive as it is to-day. In the Byzantine period it was certainly not so, and the Byzantine culture was doubtless the successor of an earlier culture which made much of the Negeb a prosperous and productive land.<sup>1</sup> That the word 'Negeb' means 'dryness, *i.e.* 'dry land,' has rightly been questioned by Winckler.<sup>2</sup> So far as I can see, critical and exegetical evidence compels us to deny that such a name as 'dry land' was likely to be applied to the N. Arabian borderland as a whole. The Negeb of the later Old Testament times was probably as different from the land bordering on S. Palestine to-day, as the N. Arabian population of to-day differs from that of antiquity. I refrain from attempting a sketch of the history of the Israelites in the times immediately preceding and following the Exile. Such a sketch would only be effective if thoroughly furnished with evidential notes, and this would take up too much space in an Introduction to the Psalter. The reader would do well to give a thorough study to the portion of *Critica Biblica* relative to the Books of Kings, and if possible to consult from time to time the portions concerned with the prophetic writings. He will thus be able to comprehend better the method and results of the inquiries of which those here introduced form a part. He may also be referred to pages 136-153 of the new edition of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, in which the reader will find the necessary preliminary information, from the pen of Winckler, on the ethnic conditions of N. Arabia in antiquity.<sup>3</sup>

Some highly probable facts, some fragments of history, may,

<sup>1</sup> The passage (Isa. xxx. 6) which appears to represent the road from the land of Judah to that of מִצְרַיִם (read, Mišrim) as infested by lions and serpents is certainly corrupt (see *Crit. Bib.*, *ad loc.*).

<sup>2</sup> Winckler compares Ass. *nagbu*, 'a particular kind of land' (*Gesch. Isr.*, ii. 184, note 2).

<sup>3</sup> On this work, and on Winckler's manifold original contributions to Old Testament study, see my article 'Babylon and the Bible,' *Hibbert Journal*, Oct., 1903. I may respectfully suggest to critics that while they may not unreasonably question very much of Winckler's reconstruction of Israelitish history, it is an altogether excessive caution which hinders them from accepting in a very full extent his treatment of the subject of a N. Arabian Mušri.

however, be mentioned here, and one of them is that deportation was no uncommon fate of the Israelite and Judahite population. We may safely hold that that section of the people of Israel and Judah which dwelt in the Negeb experienced this at the hands of several N. Arabian kings, and we may find references to one or another of these deportations in the true text of 2 K. xv. 29, xvii. 5 f., xviii. 9-11, xxiv. 12-16, xxv. 7, 11 f., in the original Prophecy of Restoration (II. Isaiah), in the prophecies in Ezekiel, in the Lamentations, in the story underlying our Ezra and Nehemiah, and at any rate in the early part of the Book of Daniel. That there were also ancient Hebrew writings which referred to Assyrian deportations of Israelites and Judahites, and to a Babylonian deportation of Judahites, is, however, a highly plausible view. The later redactors, certainly, were aware of such deportations, and manipulated the texts before them, so that they should seem to refer to Assyria or Babylon as the 'staff in Yahwē's hand,' but it is improbable that they had any evidence of this except tradition. Cuneiform research and exploration of sites will, it may be hoped, throw fresh light on these dark passages of history.

The exact situation of the districts where the Jewish exiles were placed is of course uncertain. The ancient geography of N. Arabia is unfortunately much less definitely settled than that of Palestine, though the ancient geography of Palestine itself is much less secure than has been supposed. From notices in Ezekiel, however (see *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. i. 1, 3, iii. 15), we may with much probability assume that some at any rate of the bands of exiles<sup>1</sup> were interspersed in the Negeb among the colonists brought by the king of the N. Arabian Asshur from other parts of his realm (see on 2 K. xvii. 25), and this accords with what criticism seems to have disclosed in the Lamentations and in the Psalter. How far the language of the psalmists is literally correct, and how far imaginative, is no doubt a matter for discussion. Sometimes when they speak as if they were in the lowest depths of the misery caused by the exile, they produce upon us the impression of artificiality. Certainly, too, their use of the terms *Misrites*,

<sup>1</sup> It is probable that others were at a greater distance from Palestine. See *Crit. Bib.* on Ezra vii. 7 f.

Zarephathites, Jerahmeelites, Ashhurites (see revised text), seems to be archaistic; a similar view indeed has long been current, to account for certain of the ethnic terms in the traditional text of Ps. lxxxiii. 7-9).

§ 6. It now becomes possible to give a fully satisfactory answer to a question put by our theologian-statesman, Gladstone (*Impregnable Rock*, p. 37).

'Is it conceivable, if the psalms in general owed their origin to the time of the Captivity, that the composer of them should, in numerous and conspicuous cases, have dwelt so long and so often over the details of the Egyptian bondage, and should never but once and briefly have made reference, specific indeed but narrow, to the one recent catastrophe, choosing rather to go back to the centuries dimmed in comparison by the interval of a thousand years?'

The difficulty referred to here is indeed a real one. If the Psalms come either from the 'exilic' or from the early 'post-exilic' period, how is it that, except in the case of Ps. cxxxvii., they present no distinctly Babylonian colouring? Gunkel, it is true, has pointed out some points of contact between passages of the psalms and Babylonian myths, but it is not contended that these points of contact were due to impressions received during the Exile. Not once again is Babylon mentioned; not once is even the Chaldean destruction of the temple so plainly referred to (see Delitzsch on Ps. lxxiv.) as to disarm all opposition. But from our new point of view, the psalmists do, 'in numerous and conspicuous cases,' refer to the calamity, not indeed of a Babylonian, but of a N. Arabian oppression, and the reason why the ancient Mişrite bondage is so much referred to is that, inasmuch as the land of Mişrim was in N. Arabia, the Mişrite oppression was a most fitting type of the Ashhurite or Jerahmeelite oppression. As for Ps. cxxxvii., it should have been plain to us all that, whatever be the true reading of the opening words, there can be no real difference between the name *Babel* and the name *Edom* (see vol. ii., p. 209). Ps. cxxxvii. 1 is not a 'specific but narrow' reference to the Babylonian Exile, but an imaginative representation of the by-gone time when temple-singers were carried by Edomites to the Jerahmeelite Negeb. It is not, however, really different from many other psalms; see specially Pss. xlii.-xliii., and lxiii., in which just such a sad experience of temple-singers is imaginatively and lyrically portrayed.

For this imaginative dwelling on the past there was ample justification. For once at least, and probably more than once, the temple at Jerusalem had been destroyed by N. Arabian foes, who in this way completed the (temporary) extinction of the Jewish people. Indeed, this was but the climax of a long series of outrages, which could not but wound the feelings of all true-hearted Jews. And however inevitable and natural hostility between Israel and N. Arabia may have been, we must admit that the lower forms of this hostility on the N. Arabian side (see *e.g.* Ps. v. 10, xxxv. 16-26, cxx.) indicate a moral inferiority, and we can well understand that this was the bitterest drop in Israel's cup of affliction.

The truth is that the psalms in their original form provided the necessary vent for the pent-up feelings of the Jews under N. Arabian oppression. The writers do not speak for themselves; they are the organs of the faithful part of the Jewish people, and more especially of a society within the society which is spoken of as 'the afflicted ones' or 'the sufferers' (see on Ps. ix. 13)—the same that appears to be personified in Isa. liii. and elsewhere as the 'servant of Yahwè.' There were degrees of violence in the oppression spoken of. Sometimes the psalmists speak with a consciousness that Israel's life as a people is suspended, sometimes with a presentiment that such a suspension is imminent. Sometimes it is merely the grumbling of a storm which has raged its worst that they hear; and sometimes when wronged on a small scale, they seem to keep alive the memory of greater outrages by imaginative reproductions of the situation and the sentiments of an earlier period. At other times, however, they relieve themselves by rising into a far higher sphere, to where 'beyond these voices, there is peace,' and even more than peace—jubilant rejoicing: *i.e.* they write as if the anticipations of faith had been realized, and the great deliverance were past. That there are a few perfectly peaceful psalms (see cxxvii.<sup>(2)</sup>, cxxviii., cxxxiii.-cxxxvi., cxliv.<sup>(2)</sup>-cl.), which express the feelings of a quiet and hopeful age, does not affect a general description of the character of the Psalms. The Psalter is throughout coloured by a reaction against N. Arabian tyranny and heathenism.

§ 7. Whether there are any fragments of psalms in our present Psalter which arose during the first suspension of the national life, is a question which cannot usefully be discussed.

The Psalter as it stands belongs to a highly literary age, and contains many passages which presuppose the existence of the Prophecy of Restoration, the expanded Jeremiah, and the Book of Job, all of which (unless the first be an exception) can be shown to belong to a later age. Besides this, it is doubtful whether the interval between the fall and the rising again of the Jewish state was as long as has been supposed.<sup>1</sup> In 2 K. xxv. 27-30 we are distinctly told that a king of 'Babel' called 'Evil-merodach' treated Jehoiachin kindly, and recognized him as king of Judah;<sup>2</sup> apparently there were other subject princes who were also reinstated as kings. This recognition must have involved the permission to any individuals or families who desired it, to return to their own land,<sup>3</sup> and to join in rebuilding their temple or temples. Now the land of the Jews consisted of Judah and of the Negeb (or some part of it). For it appears from 2 K. xxii., xxiii., when critically treated, that Josiah, as the sole remaining representative of Israel, had annexed that part of the Negeb which had been occupied by N. Israel, and repaired the temple of Beth-ishmael or Beth-jerahmeel (an important place in the Negeb, where David and Solomon had dwelt, and the seat of a cultus much objected to by Jeremiah), at the same time, purifying the cultus. If Jehoiachin or his son Shenazzar<sup>4</sup> was restored to the throne as a petty king, or rather 'prince' (נשיא), under 'Babel' or Jerahmeel, he would have at least a part of the

<sup>1</sup> The **שבעים שנה** of Jer. xxv. 11 is corrupt; for a parallel, note the of Judg. vi. 1, xii. 9. See on 2 Chr. xxxvi. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Winckler (*AOF*, ii. 198, 439; *KAT*, p. 284) is of opinion that the execution of 'Evil-merodach's' decree was postponed till B.C. 539. This, however, is only a conjecture, rendered necessary by the acceptance of the tradition that the Jews received permission to return and to build the temple from Kōres (Cyrus?).

<sup>3</sup> The Jerusalemites, even if in the Negeb, would naturally wish to return to Jerusalem, while the Israelitish exiles from the Negeb, if faithful to their race and religion, would as naturally wish to return to the Negeb.

<sup>4</sup> Shenazzar (**שנאצר**) in 1 Chr. iii. 18 a son of Jeconiah; rightly identified by Sir H. Howorth, Kosters, Ed. Meyer, and Marquart with Sheshbazzar (**ששבצר**). The full form of the name underlies *σαβασααρ*, *σαναμασσαρος*, *σαβασσαρος*, *σαμασσαρος*, given by G (see *E. Bib.*, 'Sheshbazzar') for 'Sheshbazzar.' Both **שמן** (see on Ps. xcii. 11, cxli. 5) and **שבן** (cp. 'Eshban' and 'Shebna') may represent **שמענאל**; so also indeed may **שן** (see *Crit. Bib.* on 1 S. vii. 12, xxviii. 4). **אצר** occurs in Gen. xxxvi. 21, &c., as a Horite (=Ashhurite) clan-name. 'Sheshbazzar' in Ezr. v. 14 (cp. i. 8) is said to have been made *fehā* or 'governor' of Judah by Kōres, and to have laid the foundation of the temple.

Negeb as well as of Judah<sup>1</sup> given back to him as his dominion. In this case, the temple in the Negeb (which had of course been greatly injured in war-time) would have to be restored as well as that of Jerusalem. It appears that some of the prophets were in favour of this temple (see *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. xl. 1 f., xlvii. 13, Isa. xix. 18) while others were against it (*Crit. Bib.* on Isa. lxvi. 1 ff.).<sup>2</sup> Probably enough, this temple too had only a short existence. How unfriendly the surrounding populations were to the Jews, appears from the narratives in Ezra and Nehemiah, which may not indeed be strictly historical works, but which must contain traces of early traditions.<sup>3</sup> Possibly too Zech. vii. 7 may refer to some calamity to the Jewish portion of the Negeb which was recent when Zechariah spoke. At any rate, we can well understand that in the time of 'Malachi' the cultus of Jerahmeel or Beth-jerahmeel met with an unqualified condemnation from zealous worshippers of Yahwè (see *Crit. Bib.* on Mal. ii. 10-16. When 'Malachi' wrote the only form of worship in the Negeb was heathenish.

But though the temple of Yahwè at Beth-ishmael (=B.-jerahmeel) can only have enjoyed a brief summer of prosperity, we need not doubt that it was a source of spiritual refreshment to many faithful Israelites, especially if it is rightly held, (a) that 'the place which Yahwè thy God shall choose' in Deuteronomy originally meant Beth-ishmael, and (b) that this place is to be identified with the famous Beth-el of ancient legend (see *Crit. Bib.* on Am. vii. 9 f.). But clearly such pious worshippers as we have supposed would want psalms. Are any of these psalms preserved in our Psalter? We may most probably answer in the affirmative, and include among the Beth-ishmael psalms, Ps. cxxii., cxxv., cxxxii., cxxxiii., cxxxiv. and cxxxv.<sup>(2)</sup> Of course, a later

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps not more than Jerusalem and the district about it (cp. Winckler).

<sup>2</sup> Standing on one of the mountains of Jerahmeel, Ezekiel (who recognizes the Negeb as the Holy Land) plans the erection of a new temple and a new holy city. Another prophetic writer declares that five Mišrite cities shall become Jewish, and one (*i.e.* the principal) shall be Ir-ashlur. From the context it appears that the religious centre of this territory, with an altar to Yahwè, should be here. On the other hand, a third writer represents a temple (in the Negeb?) as quite superfluous, the whole of Ishmael or Mišsor being Yahwè's property. See references above.

<sup>3</sup> The שִׁמְרֹן of Neh. iv. 2 is to be read Shimron, *i.e.* the Shimron in the Negeb (see *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K. xvi. 24). 'Sanballat' has come from some ethnic or gentile such as Neballati or Nebaichthi. 'Tobiah' is also a Negeb name. Gashmu=Gershon=Ashram. Horonite and Ammonite may also have a N. Arabian reference.

editor manipulated these psalms, as he did most others, to adapt them to the use of pious worshippers at the temple of Jerusalem.

That many of the psalms were intended from the first for the liturgical services at Jerusalem, is of course not open to doubt. A love of the temple almost pervades the Psalter, and for the most part the temple referred to must be that which outlasted all the other temples—those in the Negeb, in Egypt, and on Mt. Gerizim, and became theoretically at least centre of Jewish religion. As we read the psalms we seem to hear sometimes the jubilant songs of the pilgrims (xlii. 4 ; cp. Isa. xxx. 29), sometimes the praiseful shouts of the worshippers (xcv. 1 ff. ; c. 1, 4), nor can there be finer expressions of a nascent spiritual religion, not yet separated from a belief in sacred localities,<sup>1</sup> than we find in Ps. xxxvi. <sup>(2)</sup>, lxiii., and lxxxiv. It is true, there are traces of a similar stage of development in the psalms of Beth-ishmael (see especially Ps. cxxv. 1 f.), but the promise of the future belonged inevitably to the sanctuary of Jerusalem. For both temples, indeed, pious worshippers, in the 'full assurance of faith,' claimed perpetuity (cp. Ps. xxvii. 4 f., cxxxii. 14, cxxxiii. 3), but only that of Jerusalem lasted as long as Jewish religion needed such a material prop. Even this temple had its critical periods. It may have been destroyed and rebuilt on more than one occasion before the last ; indeed, without assuming a second destruction in the pre-Maccabæan period, it is difficult to account historically for the strong language of Ps. lxxiv. and lxxxix.<sup>2</sup>

There is a point of some interest in this connexion which is very generally overlooked ; it is that, not only in the old days when the temple at Jerusalem was profaned (from the higher prophetic point of view) by a distinctly Jerahmeelite cultus,<sup>3</sup> but even afterwards, the temple-ministers, or at any rate the singers, were of Jerahmeelite, *i.e.* N. Arabian, origin. Some of the evidence for this has been given in my article, 'From Isaiah

<sup>1</sup> See *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 387 f.

<sup>2</sup> We have at any rate no sufficient ground for adding Pss. lxxiv., lxxxix. to the list of Beth-ishmael psalms. It is natural to expect that these psalms would occur in the same collection, near together.

<sup>3</sup> See *Crit. Bib.*, part iv., on Kings ; also on Zeph. i. 5, and on Ezek. viii. It is assumed here that the references to the temple-worship in Kings refer to the temple of Jerusalem, not to that in the Negeb. There appears to be an early reference to the Jerahmeelite servants of the Jerusalem temple in 2 S. v. 8 (see *Crit. Bib.*). Ezekiel strongly objected to these N. Arabian ministers (see *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. xlv. 7).



to Ezra,' in the *American Journal of Theology*, July 1901. It surely ought not to be doubted that the so-called Nethinim (the older view of whose origin is untenable) are really the Ethanites, the 'doorkeepers' or 'porters' (השערים) the Asshurites, the *benê 'abdē Šelōmō* (A.V., 'the children of Solomon's servants'!) the *benê 'arāb-šalamu* (or *-išma'el*).<sup>1</sup> All these were probably guilds of singers (see § 13). We can now understand how the Levites, the 'porters,' the 'singers,' and the Nethinim come to be mentioned together in Ezr. vii. 7, Neh. vii. 73. The headings of the psalms, when keenly scrutinized, confirm this result. The evidence will be given later. It tends to show that the guilds of temple-ministers (apparently singers) to whose custody various groups of psalms were committed, were of Jerahmeelite origin. To go further, and suppose that the psalms were derived from the Negeb, and illustrate them by the not improbable fact that the main portions of the Books of Job and Proverbs took their origin in the N. Arabian border-land, is unnecessary. Suffice it to be able to say with much probability that the psalmists, though as hearty as they could be in their attachment to pure religion, were of the Jerahmeelite race. If so, it becomes all the more probable that some psalms of the Jerahmeelite temple were carefully preserved by the singing guilds of Jerusalem, and recommended for adoption in the general Israelite hymnal.

§ 8. Once more, I am not writing a historical sketch, and am not to be expected to give an answer here to every conceivable historical question. But there is one question which naturally rises to the lips here, and to which I may at least attempt a provisional answer. It is this: if, for some time after the fall of the Jewish state, N. Arabia still influenced the Jews so profoundly that there was a constant danger of the apostasy of worshippers of Yahwè, or of the introduction among the Jews of practices characteristic of N. Arabian heathenism,<sup>2</sup> how is it that the heart of the Jewish community remained sound, and a stream of healthy development flowed on without interruption? The answer is that a powerful influence for good was exercised on the community in Palestine, first, by the Law (Deuteronomic or Levitical) and the prophets, and next, by the Jews of Babylonia, who, while adher-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *Enc. Biblica*, 'Solomon's Servants, Children of.'

<sup>2</sup> See *Crit. Bib.* on Malachi.

ing steadfastly to the essentials of a Jewish religion, were yet able to absorb and adapt ideas and beliefs characteristically Babylonian and Persian. For one cannot doubt that the same policy of deportation adopted by the Assyrian kings Sargon and Sennacherib was carried out afterwards by Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, and one may be assured that, though the later Old Testament writings in their original form cannot be said to prove this,<sup>1</sup> the Jewish community afterwards passed under the rule of Persian Governors. It stands to reason that a body of men so highly •cultivated as the Babylonian Jewry must have exercised more than sufficient influence on the minds of the best Jews in Palestine to counteract the temptations offered by N. Arabia.

The proof of this is supplied by the later Hebrew literature. Not only did the author of the Priestly Code work up legal material derived from Babylonian sources, but 'thinkers and poets (see the Book of Job) deliberately threw themselves into what may quite innocently be called a mythic revival.' 'The leaders of the Church permitted this; they were content to moderate and turn to wholesome uses a tendency which they could not extinguish,'<sup>2</sup> and of which we find some fresh evidence in the Psalter (see on Ps. viii., lxxiv.<sup>(2)</sup>). It is true that Babylonian influences may sometimes have come to the early Israelites through a N. Arabian channel, but this only shows how ancient the indirect influence of Babylonia on Israel really is, and how legitimate was the course taken by the later Church-leaders. Persian influence upon Jewish belief it is more difficult to prove conclusively. Yet surely the influence which at a later time became so strong must have made itself felt very early. 'Indirectly Persia must have influenced the Jews throughout her vast empire, but directly not so much the Jews in Palestine as the large Israelitish colonies on the east of the Euphrates and the Tigris, which, however, must have transmitted the results to the Jews in Palestine.'<sup>3</sup> Certainly it is plausible to hold that the stress laid on righteousness and truthfulness in passages like Ps. xv. 2 and xvii. 3, is not wholly unconnected with the extremely high moral requirements of Zoroastrianism. The Zoroastrian

<sup>1</sup> Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Daniel (a larger or smaller part), Tobit, Judith, seem all originally to have had reference to N. Arabian oppression. See in due time *Critica Biblica*, and cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Purim,' § 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 270. Cp. the context (pp. 266-272).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*, p. 281; and cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Zoroastrianism,' §§ 20-25.

phrase, 'good thoughts, good words, good deeds,' might have been taken as a motto by the psalmists, and even if the traditional text of Pss. xvi., xvii., xlix., lxxiii. sometimes represents a late editor, and not the original writers, yet the editor's text has a historical value of its own, and we may at least in part ascribe the references which it probably contains to personal immortality and the resurrection to Zoroastrian influences. For though we can seldom draw a sharp line between Babylonian and Persian influence, such a distinction does appear to be in place here.<sup>1</sup>

These points of contact prove the receptivity of the Jews; they detract in no important respect from the originality of the Psalter.<sup>2</sup> As I have shown elsewhere, it is a monument of the church-consciousness of the period of the early Judaism, and it represents the most vital elements in the Jewish faith. These elements, however we account for their historical form, are not borrowed. We must, it is true, draw a distinction between the earlier and the later Psalter, each of which has some distinctive merits, though, from a theological point of view, the later Psalter is the richer.

It would, however, be a great mistake to regard the Psalter in either of its forms as primarily a record of Jewish theology. It is rather, first of all, a record of the changeful emotional experiences of the pious community in presence of the terrible fact of the prosperity of the wicked, who, in the earlier form of the Psalter, are again and again declared to be N. Arabians. In that Psalter, as here presented, too large a place may perhaps be given to temporary circumstances to please us. We have been accustomed to say of the writings of the early post-exilic period, such as the Psalms and the Book of Job, that they 'touch us almost more nearly than the writings of those prophets [Jeremiah and II. Isaiah], because the ideas contained in them have found simpler expression, and are less closely bound up with the historical form.'<sup>3</sup> But it can hardly be denied that the phenomena presented to us in the revised text of the Psalms are highly natural. Neither the 'exilic' nor the 'early post-exilic' period was barren of occasions for highly coloured metrical supplications of the community.

<sup>1</sup> See Zimmern, in *KAT*<sup>(3)</sup>, pp. 638 f.; Cheyne, *JRL*, pp. 257-260, *Enc. Bib.*, 5438-5442.

<sup>2</sup> Hommel's theory that Ps. xciii. may be derived from a Babylonian hymn to Ea is baseless (vol. ii., p. 89).

<sup>3</sup> Hastings, *Dict. of Bible*, Extra Volume, p. 45<sup>b</sup> (art. 'New Testament Times'), preprint.

Unless we refuse to carry the critical process further, and acquiesce in the meagre narrative which has become traditional, we must admit that pious Jews suffered greatly not only from mere 'contact with the heathen world,' not only from inconsistent fellow-Jews, 'who, with a stronger sense of actualities, plunged vigorously into the relations of life, and sought to help themselves,'<sup>1</sup> but from cruel tyrants of N. Arabian race, and those Jewish apostates ('deniers,' they are called) who abetted them. Now if the trials and sufferings of the Jews were so definite and concrete, must not the writers who gave voice to Jewish feelings have named their tyrants?

• § 9. I do not, however, wish the reader to suppose that the N. Arabians held the supreme power in Judah and in the Negeb all through the period of the original Psalter. It is true, the original form (disclosed by criticism) of Ezra and Nehemiah, Esther, Tobit, and Judith suggests that for a long time the Persians left Judah and the Negeb in the hands of the N. Arabians. But it is difficult not to believe that they did not at last interfere, and in spite of the sceptical criticism of Willrich,<sup>2</sup> the second-hand statements of the cruelty of Artaxerxes Ochus to the Jews may have a kernel of truth. The defilement of the temple and the 'enslavement' spoken of by Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 7, 1) may perhaps have taken place at this period.<sup>3</sup>

However this may be, it is probable that N. Arabians or new ethnic connexions were troublesome to the Jews long after the fall of the old Jewish state. For a time indeed a part of Judah and of the Negeb appears to have been ruled by representatives of the ancient Davidic family—representatives so weak and harmless that no umbrage could be given to the Babylonian power. And even when this rule had come to an end (perhaps through the mad ambition of a Jewish prince) we hear of a Nehemiah and a Daniel in high favour at the N. Arabian court, at least if I may refer here to results which are only in course of being established. • But upon the whole we may say, in the language of a psalmist, that Israel

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* Wonderful vagueness is assumed for writers of Semitic race!

<sup>2</sup> *Judaica* (1900), pp. 35-39; cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Psalms, Book of,' § 23.

<sup>3</sup> Cheyne, *Founders of O. T. Criticism*, pp. 220 ff.; *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 52. Cp. W. R. Smith, *OTJC*,<sup>(2)</sup> pp. 207 f., 438; Ewald, *Dichter des Alten Bundes*,<sup>(1)</sup> p. 353 (1835), and *Hist. of Israel*, v. 120. But cp. also *E. Bib.*, col. 2425 (G. A. Smith), 3941 (Cheyne).

'walked tremblingly, the Arabians pressing him hard' (Ps. xlii.-xliii., *ll.* 15, 26). According to Winckler, the old peoples of the N. Arabian border-land had given place to Kedar and Nebaioth, who in turn were succeeded by the Salamians or Salmæans and (in the first half of the second century) the Nabatæans.<sup>1</sup> There is not much hint of this in the Hebrew texts, which generally use the old familiar names for the N. Arabian countries and peoples. Nor can we omit to mention the Edomites, who were from the first among those who annoyed and oppressed Israel (cp. Obadiah), and who are from time to time mentioned with horror by the psalmists (*e.g.* Pss. xi., xii., xlix., cxxxvii.).<sup>2</sup>

How constantly the N. Arabian danger occupied the minds of the psalmists, will be best shown by giving a brief summary of the contents of their writings. It will be noticed that the same foes are referred to even in psalms which may be presumed to be of the Greek period. A literary tradition had been formed which could not, as it seems, be broken through.

§ 10. Without further explanation I proceed to summarize the contents of the Psalms from this point of view.

#### BOOK I.

i. Preface to the large Psalter, including Ethnic psalms, with their preface (ii.). The editor took a fragment of a metrical ps. on the contrasted lots of the good and the bad, and prefixed a didactic passage in irregular rhythm.

ii. Lyric anticipation of the time when the promise of an expanded Canaan made to Israel shall have been fulfilled. The N. Arabian populations will rebel against Yahwè and Israel, and will be forcibly brought back to obedience, unless they prudently renew their submission.

iii., iv. Evening psalms; N. Arabian oppression cannot disturb believers.

v. The temple-worshippers, surrounded by lying foes, pray to be guided aright.

vi. Deep depression at the danger of Israel gives way to faith.

vii.<sup>(1)</sup> Complaints of the insults of the N. Arabian foe, which threaten to pass into a pitiless 'tearing' of Israel. But soon his wickedness will prove his own ruin.

<sup>1</sup> pp. 151 f.

<sup>2</sup> See Torrey, 'The Edomites in S. Judah,' *JBL*, xvii. 16-20 (1898), and cp. Cheyne, *ibid.*, p. 207.

vii.<sup>(2)</sup> Prayer for the redress of Israel's wrongs.

viii. Fragment of lyric cosmogony. The old 'enemy,' i.e. the primæval dragon, is a symbol of the N. Arabian foe. Cp. Ezek. xxix. 3.

ix.—x. An alphabetical poem was broken in two, and the parts became independent psalms. Not, however, in G, which only gives a *διάψαλμα* (דבד) after ix. 21.

xi. 'What reward has the righteous?' Yahwè's eyes 'keep watch.' Ishmael will disappear. First trace of a sceptical tendency.

xii. Prayer for deliverance from the false-hearted race of Edom.

xiii. Deepening depression, with a corrective appendix.

xiv. The sin of Gebal and Jerahmeel, and its punishment at the great doomsday.

xv. A short moral and religious catechism in metre.

xvi. Israel rejoices in his visits to Yahwè's 'palace,' and in the sure hope of deliverance.

xvii. Israel's self-justification, the ground of his faith that Yahwè will deliver.

xviii. Righteous Israel looks back upon his completed discipline, and gives thanks for his reward.

xix.<sup>(1)</sup> The glory of God in the heavens, especially in the sun. Second creation psalm (see viii.).

xix.<sup>(2)</sup> Eulogy of the Law. Israel's prayer against apostasy.

xx., xxi. Pious Israel's joy at the prospect of the great deliverance, when N. Arabian foes will cease to trouble.

xxii.<sup>(1)</sup> Israel's desperate condition; yet he prays on.—xxii.<sup>(2)</sup> Israel at large is summoned to give thanks for the great deliverance. N. Arabian oppression is in the background.

xxiii.<sup>(1)</sup> Whatever befalls, the flock of Yahwè is at peace;

xxiii.<sup>(2)</sup> Israel anticipates the Messianic feast (Isa. xxv. 6).

xxiv.<sup>(1)</sup> A second little catechism on the character of Yahwè's true worshippers.

xxiv.<sup>(2)</sup> The victorious return of the divine Warrior (Isa. lxiii. 1-6).

xxv. An alphabetical psalm. Petitions for deliverance, for instruction in the principles of Yahwè's dealings, and for the punishment of Israel's oppressors.

xxvi. Israel's innocence, the ground of his prayer for help.

xxvii.<sup>(1)</sup> Calm but deep joy in Yahwè, in whose sanctuary is assurance of safety.—xxvii.<sup>(2)</sup> 'Anxious supplication.

xxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> Imprecations on the wicked.—xxviii.<sup>(2)</sup> A fragment of thanksgiving.

xxix. Yahwè is now king of Israel and the world ; he sends a message to the surviving Jerahmeelites, conveyed by an awful thunder-storm. The message is that Yahwè has taken his seat as Judge. At this, Yahwè's new subjects are called upon to offer praise and, it may be implied, tribute.

xxx. Israel imaginatively realizes the time when complaint will give way to thanksgiving.

xxxi. A mixture of complaints and thanksgivings. The psalm has been much edited ; it may be composite, though analysis is difficult.

xxxii.<sup>(1)</sup> Israel's sufferings ; (temporary) relief ; prayer still necessary.—xxxii.<sup>(2)</sup> Didactic.

xxxiii. Quasi-alphabetic (p. 138) ; no title (but see G). Praise and prayer ; Yahwè's character and purpose, Israel's faith.

xxxiv. Alphabetic. Experience proves that Yahwè delivers righteous Israel.

xxxv. A prayer against Israel's foes. Their cruel behaviour ; Israel's self-humiliation.

xxxvi.<sup>(1)</sup> The wickedness of the oppressor. Second trace of sceptical tendency.—xxxvi.<sup>(2)</sup> Yahwè's lovingkindness is sure.

xxxvii. Alphabetical. A retributive judgment is at hand.

xxxviii. Israel's affliction described under the figure of sickness.

xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> The mental agony of unwilling sceptics.—xxxix.<sup>(2)</sup> Faith holds its own under severe trial.

xl.<sup>(1)</sup> Gratitude for great deliverance. Prayer for the future.—xl.<sup>(2)</sup> Anxiety passes into stern imprecations.

xli. Israel's affliction is again likened to a dangerous sickness.

## BOOK II.

xl.ii.—xl.iii. A company of Jews, in N. Arabian captivity, craves the divine protection and restoration to Yahwè's house. The point of view is imaginative.

xliv.<sup>(1)</sup> Preface to a lost historical psalm.—xliv.<sup>(2)</sup> Prayer of the innocent martyr-nation. Assumed background of the Exile.

xl. v. Celebration of the Messiah as the second Solomon.

xlvi. In the great upheaval of hostile peoples which precedes the great judgment pious Israel remains undaunted.

xl. vii. Thanksgiving for the overthrow of Edomites. To faith, the Messianic age has begun.

xlvi. Again, imaginative thanksgivings.

xlix. The fate of all who deny Yahwè, whether Edomites or recreant Israelites.

l.<sup>(1)</sup> Fragment of a psalm on the Messianic judgment.—l.<sup>(2)</sup> A restatement of the true law of sacrifice.—l.<sup>(3)</sup> A threatening address of Yahwè to hypocrites.

li. Pious Israel, suffering from calamities which prove the greatness of his sins, craves forgiveness, the proof of which will be deliverance from the Edomites.

lii. A prophetic denunciation of the N. Arabian tyrants (cp. cix.).

• liii. An Elohist edition of Ps. xiv.

liv., lv.<sup>(1)</sup> Pious Israel implores deliverance.—lv.<sup>(2)</sup> The wickedness of the Jerahmeelites.

lvi.—lvii.<sup>(1)</sup> Fresh supplications for help.—lvii.<sup>(2)</sup> A hymn or praise.

lviii. Faith anticipates the ruin of the 'deniers' of Yahwè who bear rule in the land.

lix. The Arabians prepare to crush Israel. Let Yahwè interpose.

lx. Believing prayer kindles the spirit of prophecy. With Yahwè, unwarlike Israel shall overcome Arabia.

lxi.<sup>(1)</sup> A wail of persecuted Jews.—lxi.<sup>(2)</sup> Gratitude for a past deliverance, and anticipations of the great doomsday.

lxii. Let Israel be patient ; the oppressor will be requited as he deserves.

lxiii. Far from the sanctuary, pious Jews express their longing for Yahwè, and their anticipations of the judgment.

lxiv. Fresh complaints, and comforting anticipations.

lxv. Israel in the latter day gives thanks for his spiritual privileges and for the destruction of his enemies.

lxvi.<sup>(1)</sup> Praise for the mercies of the Messianic age.—lxvi.<sup>(2)</sup> Grateful Israel will offer the sacrifices which he vowed in his trouble.

lxvii. Anticipations of Yahwè's righteous rule.

lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> Praise, and retrospect of Israel's early mercies.—

lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup> Yahwè's faithfulness in the past prompts supplication for the fulfilment of his promises in the future.

lxix.<sup>(1)</sup> Israel's afflictions described ; all is known to Yahwè ; pay the persecutors their deserts !—lxix.<sup>(2)</sup> Israel imagines himself in the latter day praising his God. Why not ? The promises are sure.



lxx. Same as xl. 14-18.—lxxi. Israel in his 'old age' prays for relief, and promises songs of praise.

lxxii. Predictions of the reign of the Messiah.

### Book III.

lxxiii. A temporary failure of faith. Pious Israel despaired of a recompense, but, giving heed to God's judgments, came to a better mind, and recovered his joy in Yahwè.

lxxiv.<sup>(1)</sup> Israel's complaints in the deepest misery of the N. Arabian invasion. The point of view is imaginative.—lxxiv.<sup>(2)</sup> Yahwè's ancient exploits. From an anticipative song of triumph.

lxxv. A fragment. The oppressors are warned, on the ground of a divine promise to Israel, not to 'rage' so furiously against the exiled Jews.

lxxvi. Anticipations of the final deliverance.

lxxvii.<sup>(1)</sup> Another record of temptations to scepticism (cp. lxxiii.).—lxxvii.<sup>(2)</sup> Description of a theophany.

lxxviii. A popular exposition of the early history of Israel.

lxxix. A companion-psalm to lxxiv.<sup>(1)</sup>.

lxxx. An (imaginative ?) appeal for help against those who have rent the 'vine' of Israel.

lxxxi.<sup>(1)</sup> Praise to Yahwè as King of Israel.—lxxxi.<sup>(2)</sup> Yahwè remonstrates with and admonishes Israël.

lxxxii. Yahwè himself announces the impending retribution of the unjust judges.

lxxxiii. Israel's impassioned cry for divine vengeance.

lxxxiv. Exiled Jews long to return to the sanctuary of Zion.

lxxxv.<sup>(1)</sup> Prayer for the great deliverance.—lxxxv.<sup>(2)</sup> Comforting promises.

lxxxvi. Petitions for protection, intermingled (by an editor ?) with thanksgivings.

lxxxvii. The happiness of Zion or Israel, whose family now includes the converted remnants of the peoples round about.

lxxxviii. Despondency with no ray of hope.

lxxxix. Anticipative praise for the great deliverance.—

lxxxix.<sup>(2)</sup> Contrast between the glowing promises of 2 S. vii. and present distress.

### Book IV.

xc. Appeal of oppressed Israel for help and compensation. The psalm has been recast.

xc1. Israel's felicity in the Messianic age.

xcii.—xciii.—xcv.<sup>(1)</sup> Thanksgiving for the great deliverance, and the expansion of Israel's land which faith anticipates.

xciv.<sup>(1)</sup> An impassioned cry for vengeance, like lxxxiii. xciv.<sup>(2)</sup> The scepticism, into which Israel lapsed for a moment, according to xciv.<sup>(1)</sup>, is rebuked, and the difficulty which led to it explained.

xcv.<sup>(2)</sup> A divine warning against disobedience (cp. lxxxi.<sup>(2)</sup>).

xcvi.—xcvii.—xcviii. Further development of the theme of Pss. xcii., &c. Arabia is to join in the song of praise.

• xcix. Anticipation of the conversion of N. Arabians, and even of their admission into the ranks of the priesthood.

• c. The expanded Israel is called upon to praise Yahwè.

ci. The vow of the Messianic king (cp. xlv., lxxii.).

cii.<sup>(1)</sup> 'Prayer for the sufferer (Israel), when he faints.'—cii.<sup>(2)</sup> Happy anticipations for Israel.—cii.<sup>(3)</sup> The world perishable, but Yahwè eternal.

ciii. Praise of the lovingkindness of Yahwè.

civ. The hymn of creation, closing with a glance at those who mar its harmony.

cv.—cvi.<sup>(2)</sup> Israel's early history (cp. lxxviii.).

cvi.<sup>(1)</sup> Liturgical prayer and praise.

cvii.<sup>(1)</sup> Thanksgiving with scenes from the experience of Israel.

cvii.<sup>(2)</sup> Historical references of a wider range.

cviii. A compound of lvii. 8-12 and lx. 7-14.

cix. Imprecations against the N. Arabian tyrants (cp. lii.).

cx. A prophecy of Israel's conquest of the N. Arabian borderland.

cx1.—cxii. Alphabetical, didactic psalms.

cxiii. The lovingkindness of the Most High God to Israel.

cxiv. The first Exodus ; a type of the second ?

cxv. A confession of faith, and a declaration of trust, in the one true God.

cxvi.—cxviii. Songs of praise at the opening of the Messianic age.

cxvii. Praise to Him who is God of Israel and of the world.

cxix. The blessedness of a life in accordance with God's revealed will.

cxx.—cxxiii. Weary Israel implores the divine succour.

cxxi. In sure faith Israel looks out for the divine help.

cxxii. A psalm for lovers of the N. Arabian house of Yahwè. Cp. cxxv., cxxxii., cxxxiii., cxxxiv., cxxxv.<sup>(2)</sup>.

cxxiv.—cxxxix. Israel's marvellous escape.

cxxvi. Laughter has given place to tears, but joy will return.

cxxvii.<sup>(1)</sup> Yahwè is the Watcher ; wherefore be anxious ?

cxxvii.<sup>(2)</sup> Stalwart sons, a blessing.

cxxviii. Domestic blessedness of the righteous.

cxxx. An appeal for the destruction of the enemies of the true religion.

cxxxi. Israel professes his humility. Very corrupt text.

cxxxii. Reassertion of the promises in 2 S. vii. 12 ff., with a historical setting. The temple of Beth-jerahmeel probably meant.<sup>4</sup> See cxxii., &c.

cxxxiv., cxxxv.<sup>(1)</sup> The ministers of the same temple are summoned to praise Yahwè.

cxxxv.<sup>(2)</sup>, cxxxvi. Praise of Yahwè for his mercies to Israel. The former a Beth-ishmael psalm.

cxxxvii. Temple-singers look back on the misery of their guild in captivity.

cxxxviii., cxxxix. Thanksgiving and prophecy combined. The latter psalm, as recast, is partly a celebration of divine attributes.

cxl. Israel supplicates for vengeance on its foes.

cxli. Prayer against the N. Arabians. Afterwards much recast.

cxlii. A cry from the N. Arabian captivity.

cxliii. The same subject ; familiar petitions re-combined.

cxliv.<sup>(1)</sup> A similar but more eucharistic psalm.

cxliv.<sup>(2)</sup> A fragment on the felicity of Yahwè's people.

cxlv., cxlvi. Praise of Yahwè's attributes.

cxlvii.<sup>(1)(2)</sup> Praise of Yahwè, with special reference to Jerusalem.

cxlviii.—cl. Call to universal praise.

§ II. The reader will consult his own interest if he will compare the treatment given in this work to such psalms as xxxv., xlii.-xliii., xlv., lx., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxxiii., cxxxvii. with that found in the ordinary commentaries, not excepting even the least conventional of all—that of Duhm. It will be surprising if these psalms do not appear much more natural and life-like, with the new background, than in a text less thoroughly corrected. Other groups of psalms which call for a similar treatment are the traditional 'royal psalms' (ii., xviii., xx., xxi., [xxviii.,] xlv., lxi., lxiii., lxxii., [lxxxiv.,] [lxxxix.,] [ci.,] [cx.,] [cxxxii.]),<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The numbers enclosed in [ ] are those of psalms in which the word מלך does not occur.

and the traditional psalms of immortality (xvi., xvii., xlix., lxxiii.).

Controversy is not the present writer's object, but some consideration is due to G. B. Gray's able attempt (*JQR*, July, 1895, pp. 658-686) to show that even those psalms which, in so far as they refer to a king who is neither Yahwè nor a foreigner, may seem to be necessarily pre-exilic, can be explained as post-exilic without resorting to the improbable hypothesis that they refer to an Asmonæan king (or kings):

• Hethinks that in Pss. ii., lxxii., xviii., lxxxix., xxi., the king referred to is an idealisation of the people with reference to its sovereign functions, and that the expressions used in these psalms can only, or at least most satisfactorily, be explained by the circumstances, not of an individual monarch, but of the (royal) nation. In Ps. lxi., probably also in Ps. lxxiii., the poet speaks in the name of the nation, and consequently appropriates the term 'king.' Possibly Pss. xx. and cx. may be analogously explained. In Ps. xxxiii. the reference is purely proverbial, and Ps. xlv., the interpretation of which is specially difficult, may excusably be left out of account.

This view<sup>1</sup> does but give a sharper outline to a view to which some of the best scholars have been tending - viz., that the ideal king referred to in certain psalms is a representative and virtually a personification of the people. As the text stands, we find post-exilic Israel spoken of as Yahwè's anointed one in Ps. xxviii. 8, lxxxix. 38, 51 [39, 52,], Hab iii. 13,<sup>2</sup> and it would have been but a step further to call the people of Israel by the ordinary royal title.

Was this step actually taken? Hardly, if it be true that there are in the prophetic literature distinct announcements of a future ideal Davidic king. The religious phraseology of the Jews would surely have been thrown into hopeless confusion if 'king' sometimes really meant 'king,' and at other times signified 'people.' There were honourable titles enough to give the personified people—'son of Yahwè,' 'servant of Yahwè,' and even perhaps 'Yahwè's anointed one.' The phrase 'Yahwè's anointed one,' if our text is correct in reading it, is specially important, because it 'is either applied or applicable to any one who has received from God some unique commission of a directly or

<sup>1</sup> See also Smend, *Rel.-gesch.* (2), pp. 373 ff; Wellh., *IJG* (3), p. 207. Smend has now given up the supposed reference of Ps. ii. to Alexander Jannæus (*Rel.-gesch.* 1), p. 384), and holds with Gray.

<sup>2</sup> See *Psalms* in *SBOT*, p. 176 (cp. p. 164, on ii. 7), and *Isaiah*, p. 196.

indirectly religious character';<sup>1</sup> in other words, it does not necessarily connote royalty. When we consider that psalms addressed to the king, or relating to the king, had probably come down to our psalmists from pre-exilic times, it is very bold to assume that the psalmists sometimes use the term 'king' as an honorific title for the Jewish people.<sup>2</sup> The conclusion arrived at in the present work is that there are only three royal psalms (xlv., lxxii., ci.). The Messianic belief was held, but was not yet widely popular. The other psalms in the above list have to be thoroughly criticized textually; for the general result see summary of contents of Psalms (pp. xxvi.-xxxii.).

Duhm's opinion on Ps. xlix. also deserves a reference. It is that the psalmist holds a doctrine of the immortality of the pious, connected with well-defined ideas as to the dwelling-place of the good after death. Charles's treatment of Pss. xlix. and lxxiii. (*Enc. Bib.*, cols. 1346 f.) is stronger, because of the setting which he gives these works in the Jewish literature. But in such difficult psalms a keener textual criticism is imperatively demanded. This is the fault of the discussion in *OP*, 381 ff., 406, which has points of affinity to that of Charles. At the same time, it is not for a moment denied that, for the period of the last editor, the existing text, with the traditional eschatological explanation, has a genuine historical value. Theologically, here as elsewhere, his redaction of corrupt passages is full of interest.

§ 12. It is now time to consider the titles or headings of the Psalms in the Massoretic text. I have already alluded to them in connexion with the question of Beth-ishmael psalms (pp. xx. ff.), and mentioned my conclusion that the temple-singers were of Jerahmeelite extraction. The grounds of this conclusion have now to be set forth.

The theories as to the titles at present in vogue have on the whole but little to recommend them. But it was inevitable that here again the prejudice in favour of the Massoretic text should injuriously affect criticism. Speaking of the titles in general, a disinterested Jewish scholar (Ad. Neubauer) observes that

<sup>1</sup> *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 338.

<sup>2</sup> See *Enc. Bib.*, col. 3942. Toy's clear and instructive essay, 'The king in Jewish post-exilian writings' (*JBL*, xviii. 156 ff. [1899]), does not directly refer to this question.

<sup>3</sup> 'The Titles of the Psalms according to early Jewish authorities,' *Studia Biblica*, vol. ii., p. 57.

'when all traditional matter is exhausted, the only remaining resource is the critical method, which, however, on the present subject has as yet made no considerable progress.' As to the tradition the same witness states that from the different explanations (which he quotes at length) it is evident that the meaning of them was early lost. Next, as to the assignment of psalms to David, Solomon, Moses, the bnê Kōrah, &c. (a) With regard to *lědāwīd* and similar titles, it is asserted by Keil that it was the custom of Arabian poets to attach their names to their works. This, however, cannot be shown. The old poets did not write their poems. Each of them had his *rāwēī*, or 'reciter,' who learned each poem, and transmitted it to others.

It is, however, true, as Nöldeke has shown, that late Arabic poems are sometimes ascribed to ancient writers with an object; also that the Arabian narrators would illustrate dry historical notices by poetical passages of their own composition which they assigned to their heroes. This would fit in with the theory (d) that the 'Davidic' psalms (לְדָוִד) were composed to illustrate a biography of David. But how can any one conceive that lyrics so unsuitable<sup>1</sup> were composed with this object by the psalmists, who were, as we must presume, men of no common intelligence? That the circumstances of David's life are at all a natural setting for the 78 'Davidic' psalms, and that this 'man of war' (1 Chr. xxviii. 3) could have been regarded by a psalmist as capable of writing Ps. li. or Ps. ci.<sup>(2)</sup> is one of the rashest of all possible hypotheses. Then there is the adverse parallel of the titles לְבְנֵי קֹרַח (E.V. 'of the sons of Kōrah') and לְאַסָּף (E.V. 'of Asaph'). On the other side it may be urged, i. that the subscription in Ps. lxxii. 20 *appears* to assert that the preceding psalms were composed by David. But the subscription is at any rate comparatively late, and indeed (see pp. xliii., xlix., lxxv.) is most probably corrupt. ii. It may also be urged that David was regarded in the time of the Chronicler as the founder of the temple services as then organized. That, however, does not account for the selection of particular psalms to bear the honourable title לְדָוִד, and, as Sanday remarks,<sup>2</sup> we should have expected that the influence of the Chronicler,<sup>3</sup> who ascribes to David a

<sup>1</sup> The contrast between Ps. li. and ci. is also worth noticing in this connexion. It is not greater, however, than the contrast between Ps. ci. and Ps. cix. On the position of Ps. ci., cp. Driver, in Sanday's *Oracles of God*, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> *Oracles of God*, p. 148.

<sup>3</sup> But see § 22.

composite psalm, made up of obviously post-exilic psalms, would have been sufficient to bring the name of David into the titles of the three psalms. iii. Nor is it a safer argument that some of the titles supplement לָדוֹד by express references to events in king David's life. For such additions only make it more improbable that the psalmists should be responsible for ascribing temple-psalms to David. It still remains, however, to *account* for this enigmatical title.

(b) Equally difficult is the title לְשִׁלְמֹה (R.V., of Solomon') in Pss. lxxii., cxxvii. Ps. lxxii., however, consists of anticipations of the benefits to be enjoyed under some great king's rule, which compels us to render, inconsistently, 'for Solomon' (so L.V., following G, *eis* Σαλο(ω)μων). The moderns reject this rendering, assuming that לָדוֹד means 'written by David,' but give no adequate explanation of the origin of לְשִׁלְמֹה. In Ps. cxxvii. G is without this inscription; A.V. renders 'for Solomon.' How unintelligent the psalmist is in both cases made, need not be pointed out. But what does this strange title mean?

(c) The title לְמוֹשֶׁה is peculiar to Ps. xc. Grotius comments, 'Not composed by Moses himself, but agreeable to his circumstances and his mind, τίνας ἂν λόγους εἴποι ὁ Μωσῆς.' This implies the rendering 'with reference to Moses,' which is contrary to the analogy of לָדוֹד. Besides, we must really assume the psalmist to have had intelligence enough to produce something more suitable to the assumed character of Moses. This heading too has still to be explained.

(d) לְבְנֵי קֹרַח; what does this signify? If לָדוֹד means 'composed by David,' לְבְנֵי קֹרַח ought to mean 'composed by the benê Kōrah.' This is not an impossible meaning. The psalmists sought no honour for themselves. The only point of interest to chronicle may have been the guild in whose name the psalmist wrote. But who are the benê Kōrah? In 1 Chr. xii. 6 certain Kōrḥites are mentioned among those who joined David at Ziklag; evidently Kōrah was the name of a clan (cp. 1 Chr. ii 43). Elsewhere in Chronicles the Kōrḥites are referred to as 'keepers of the thresholds' (1 Chr. ix. 19), as 'porters' or 'door-keepers' (1 Chr. xxvi. 1), and as singers (2 Chr. xx. 19). Under which character are they referred to here? And how can the three characters be accounted for? The second question has indeed been answered (see e.g. W. R. Smith, *OTJC*,<sup>(2)</sup> p. 204), but not decisively.

(e) **לֵאסָף**. That the earliest tradition meant 'composed by the singer Asaph' (see 1 Chr. xvi. 5, 7) is improbable. The phrase is clearly=**לְבַנִּי אֶסָף**, 'composed by the benê Asaph'? In the great post-exilic list we find a group of 128 (or 148) persons described as 'the singers, the bne Asaph' (Ezr. ii. 41, Neh. vii. 44; cp. Neh. xi. 22, 2 Chr. xxxv. 15). But who were these Asaphites?

(f) Heman and Ethan seem to be represented as each the author of a psalm (Pss. lxxxviii., lxxxix.). Presumably the earliest tradition meant by these designations guilds or subdivisions of guilds. But how came they to be described as Ezrahite? In 1 K. v. 9 [iv. 31] Ethan the Ezrahite, Heman, Calcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol, are mentioned as sages who were surpassed in wisdom by Solomon. Kirkpatrick (*Psalms*, p. 524 f.) assumes that they belonged to the tribe of Judah (cp. 1 Chr. ii. 6), but is puzzled to tell how Heman and Ethan could be both Levites and Ezrahites. Is there really no explanation?

(g) **לִידִיתוֹן** (G, τῶ Ἰδιθουν, **עֲלִידוֹתוֹן** (ὑπὲρ Ἰδιθουν). On the analogy of **לְבַנִּי אֶסָף**=**לֵאסָף** we may assume that **לִידִיתוֹן**=**לְבַנִּי יֵד**, i.e. that the early tradition took Ps. xxxix. to be the work of a singing family or guild (cp. 1 Chr. xxv. 3) called Jedithun or Jeduthun. If so, we must suppose that **עַל** in **עֲלִידִי** is incorrectly used for **אֶל** or **לְ**. In the title of Pss. xlv. (xlvi.) and xlvi. (xlviii.) G gives ὑπὲρ τῶν υἱῶν Κορε, where M has **לְבַנֵּי-קֹרַח**; i.e., G reads **עַל בְּנֵי ק**. According to modern critics, Jeduthun is identical with Ethan<sup>1</sup> (Stade, *GVI*, ii. 201, note 1, refers to 1 Chr. ix. 16, xxv. 1, 6, 2 Chr. v. 12, xxxv. 15, Neh. xi. 17). But whence came this strange variation of name? Of course, it is open to us to say that 'Jeduthun' is not properly a personal name, but a musical term which ultimately became the name of a chief singer.<sup>2</sup> But what a strange transformation!

The other technical terms or phrases attached to the text of the psalms are mostly so improbably explained that I will merely refer the reader for the current hypotheses to Bâthgen's or Kirkpatrick's commentary, or to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*

<sup>1</sup> Köberle (*Die Tempelsänger im Alten Testament*, p. 163) supposes that the singer Ethan arose out of Jedithun, 'perhaps under the influence of 1 K. v. 11,' &c. Such hypotheses are virtually a confession of the hopelessness of the question. Clearly we must look for a fresh clue.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Smith, *OTJC*<sup>(2)</sup>, p. 143; Köberle, p. 162.



(special articles). Three of these, however, being specially important, may be considered here with reference to current theories.

(a) **למנצח**, A.V. 'to (R.V., for) the Chief Musician.' The general modern opinion is that **המנצח** means 'the precentor,' 'the director of the music,' and the **ל** is thought to intimate that the psalm which follows was handed over to the precentor to be used in the temple services. The Anglo-American lexicon, however, explains, 'Belonging to the Director's collection of psalms' (cp. § 17), assuming (if I understand right) that **דוד**, **בני קרח**, &c., were titles of minor Psalters, and that there was a Director's Psalter consisting mainly of psalms taken from the David-Psalter. This is difficult to take in; a more improbable title for a Psalter than 'the Director' can hardly be imagined. And does **המנ** really mean the Director of Music? The significance of the fact that, for **לְמַנְצַח**, G gives *ἐς τὸ τέλος*, and has evidently no idea of a possible use of the verb **נָצַח** in a musical connection, appears not to be generally recognized. It is true, Driver<sup>1</sup> 'doubts greatly' whether 'the ignorance of the LXX.' is very important. 'The LXX.,' he says, in all parts of their translation . . . are apt to stand apart from the Palestinian tradition; they frequently show themselves to be unfamiliar not only with uncommon or exceptional words, but even with those which one would have expected to be well-known.' He illustrates this from **נָצַח**, the verb of which **מְנַצֵּחַ** (according to Driver, 'precentor') is the participle. 'It is hardly possible that a word familiarly known in Palestine *circa* 300 B.C., and (in its musical connection) retained in use in the temple services, should have had its meaning forgotten there during the period of one or two centuries which may have elapsed between 300 B.C. and the date at which the LXX. translation of the Chronicles and Ezra was made; yet the translators of these books have evidently no idea of its meaning when used in that connection.' It is admitted, however, that there is no passage in Ezra, and but one in Chronicles, in which **נָצַח** is used with reference to music, and though Driver says that in 1 Chr. xv. 21 the LXX. 'show themselves to be entirely unacquainted with the meaning of the verb,' it does not appear that modern philology has succeeded in showing what **לְנִצֵּחַ** means. *BDB* states that **בְּכִנּוֹת עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית לֵן**

<sup>1</sup> In Sanday's *Oracles of God*, p. 146.

means, 'over the bass voices, leading them with **בְּנִרוֹת**.' But since **בב** is separated from **לנ** by **הַשְּׂמִינִית**, and since no *proof* of the sense 'bass voices' for **שְׂמִינִית** can be adduced, we may venture to question this interpretation which neither of the two other standard Hebrew Lexicons ratifies. The text is certainly not free from corruption (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Sheminith,' 'Shemiramoṯh'); and **לנצה** should be pointed **לְנָצַח** (= **תמיד**, xvi. 6). The LXX. therefore does not deserve the imputation of ignorance, the verb **נצה** not having yet been proved to have a special musical sense (for an ingenious but very far-fetched suggestion, see Ges.-Buhl); and the fact that it substitutes **לנצה** for **למנצה** suggests that the translator, whose aloofness from Palestine may be exaggerated, knew that there was no real Palestinian tradition on the subject. The Cimmerian darkness can only be mitigated by critical conjecture.

(b) **שיר למ'** or **שיר המעלות** (cxxi.). This looks plain enough. i. The most natural rendering is 'song of (or, for) the steps' (so G J). But what can this mean? According to *Middoth* ii. 5 the fifteen psalms so entitled (Pss. cxx.-cxxxiv.) were sung by the Levites at the Feast of Booths on the fifteen steps which led from the Court of the Women to the Court of the Men. Against this artificial explanation, see Delitzsch. ii. It is just possible that **מעלה** may have been a term for the 'going up' of the returning exiles to Palestine, or of the pilgrims to Jerusalem at the great festivals. The former view is taken by the Peshittā, and perhaps by **ἄσμα τῶν ἀναβάσεων**, or **εἰς τὰς ἀναβάσεις**. The latter meets with much favour from the moderns. But 1. the contents of all the psalms in question do not suit these theories, and 2. there is no adequate authority for the supposed use of **מעלה** (Ezr. vii. 9 may be suspected of corruptness). We must therefore look further.

(c) The word or formula **הַלְלוּיָהּ** also appears, but is not really, quite plain. It is generally found both in M and in G at the beginning of psalms; see cvi., cxi.-cxiii., cxxxv., cxlvi.-cl., and in G the following psalms as well, civ. [cv.], cvi. [cvii.], cxiii. [cxiv.-cv.], cxiv. [cxvi.: 1-9], cxv. [cxvi.: 10-19], cxvi.-cxviii. [cxvii.-cxix.], cxxxv. [cxxxvi.], cxlvii. [cxlvii.: 12-20]. In Pss. civ., cv., cxv.-cxvii., however, M gives 'Hallelujah' at the end of the psalm, and in M's text of Pss. cxxxv. and cxlvi.-cl., as well as in G's text of Ps. cl., 'Hallelujah' occurs both at the beginning and

at the end of a psalm. What does the word or formula mean? The natural explanation is that it was a call to the congregation to join in reciting a psalm, or in responding by a united acclamation of praise. But in the temple, at any rate, the congregation did not join in the service of song. The formula would seem to have grown up in the services of the synagogue. It is stranger that such a formula should not be more extensively found, and strangest of all, because contrary to analogy, that 'Praise ye Yah' should be found as a title at all.

(d) The term סלה plays a great part in recent theories as to the origin and structure of the psalms. How often does it occur? In the Massoretic text, certainly, it is found 71 times in 39 psalms. But the LXX. does not entirely coincide with M, nor indeed do all the groups of MSS. of the LXX. give διάψαλμα (סלה) in all the same places. The true theory ought to throw some light upon this. The following are the references for סלה in M.

iii. 3, 5, 9. iv. 3, 5. vii. 6. ix. 17, 21. xx. 4. xxi. 3. xxiv. 6, 10. xxxii. 4, 5, 7. xxxix. 6, 12. xlv. 9. xlv. 4, 8, 12. xlvii. 5. xlviii. 9. xlix. 14, 16. l. 6. li. 5, 7. liv. 5. lv. 8, 20a. lvii. 4a, 7. lix. 6, 14. lx. 6. lxi. 5. lxii. 5, 9. lxvi. 4, 7, 15. lxvii. 2, 5. lxviii. 8, 20, 33. lxxv. 4. lxxvi. 4, 10. lxxvii. 4, 10, 16. lxxxi. 8. lxxxii. 2. lxxxiii. 9. lxxxiv. 5, 9. lxxxv. 3. lxxxvii. 3, 6. lxxxviii. 8, 11. lxxxix. 5, 38, 46, 49. cxl. 4, 6, 9. cxliii. 6.

סלה also occurs, as M and G agree, three times in Habakkuk (iii. 3, 9, 13), and διάψαλμα (סלה) is found twice in the Greek of the 'Psalms of Solomon' (xvii. 31; xviii. 10). It occurs usually but once in a psalm, but in several cases twice and even thrice; Ps. lxxxix. actually has four סלה. The accents connect it closely with the preceding word, as if it formed part of the text; 'A J T' also assume this view. We pass on to the meaning.

(1) There are two streams of tradition. (a) Jewish opinion unanimously makes it a synonym of נצח or עולם; so too Jerome (epistle to Marcella), who holds that it either has a connecting value, or shows that what has been said is everlasting. (b) The Greek of the LXX., followed by ΣΘ (generally), give διάψαλμα. But this word continues to be almost as enigmatical as סלה itself; will the Egyptian Greek papyri some day throw light upon it?

<sup>1</sup> See Suicer, i. 890; Lagarde, *Novæ Psalterii Græci Editionis Specimen*, p. 10; B. Jacob, *ZATW*, xvi. 173 ff. (1896). Kautzsch (*Die Poesie u. die poet. Bücher*, 1902, p. 39) explains 'Verstärktes Spiel.'

(2) According to a widely held opinion סלה indicates a break either in the singing or in the words sung. On this hypothesis, all the psalms with סלה are shown thereby to have belonged to the temple-services. But B. Jacob, who holds this view, is obliged to admit that there are temple-psalms (*e.g.* the so-called Hallelujah psalms, except cvii. and cxv.), which, for some obscure reason, have no סלה. Briggs gives a new form to the theory. He thinks that when a section of a psalm or a prayer was used apart from its context in liturgical service it was followed by a doxology, and that סלה divides a psalm into liturgical sections.<sup>1</sup>

(3) Etymological explanations. Most moderns connect סלה with שָׁלַל 'to raise.' This makes it a call for the musicians to strike up (so König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 539), or a direction to 'lift up' a benediction or doxology (Briggs). The former explanation is thought to be confirmed by the combination of 'Selah' in Ps. ix. 17 with 'Higgaion,' usually rendered 'loud playing' (see, however, vol. i., p. 36, on *l.* 74), also by an examination of the passages in which 'Selah' occurs. It is admitted that there are 'Selah'-passages which do not suggest that there is a need of a louder accompaniment. But in these cases it is thought that the סלה may have been either misplaced or inserted in error. Unfortunately the etymological basis of this theory is precarious. Hence, as a last resource, Paulus Cassel conjectured that סלה may represent the Greek ψάλλε (against which, however, see Bähthgen), and G. Dalman that it may be the Greek σελίς, which means, not only 'page' or 'column,' but also 'the space between two lines.' It will be seen, however, that all the other words on our list can be explained without the help of Greek. Once more it becomes plain that criticism must either take a step in advance, or confess itself beaten.

§ 13. How this is to be done, is no matter of uncertainty. Our only hope can be in a deliberate, and persistent use of the methods, new as well as old, of critical (as opposed to arbitrary) conjecture. The following conspectus presents revised results of such a course of action—results open in several cases to further modification. If the results are negative, they are also positive; and who can say that the explanations for which, with extreme

<sup>1</sup> See Prof. Briggs, 'An inductive study of Selah,' *JBL*, xviii. 132 ff., and *cp.* Miss E. Briggs' learned paper on Selah in *AJS*, xvi. 1-29. See also B. Jacob, 'Beiträge,' &c., i. Sela, *ZATW*, xvi. 129 ff. (1896); Parisot, 'Signification musicale de Selah-Diapsalma,' *Rev. biblique*, 1 Oct., 1899, pp. 573 ff.

deliberation, substitutes are offered, are worthy of their place in commentaries and lexicons which are otherwise, even if far from perfect, at any rate neither unprogressive nor unmethodical? It should be added with reference to the historical or quasi-historical references appended to a number of titles, that it has seemed most convenient to give these separately.

1. *'Alāmōth*, upon (עֲלֵמֹת), xlvi. [xlix.]; *Ma'ālōth*, the (הַמַּעֲלוֹת), and *Ma'ālōth*, for the (לַמַּעֲלוֹת), cxx.-cxxxiv. [ל' in cxxi.]; *Maḥālath*, upon (עַל־מַחֲלַת), liii., and with the addition of *L'annōth* (לְעֲנוֹת, from עֲלָמוֹת), lxxxviii.; *Nēhīlōth*, upon the (אֶל־הַנְּחִילוֹת, from אֶל־מַחֲלַת), v. All these (for עַל = אֶל = ל') originated in לִישְׁמַעְאֵלִים or לִירַחְמַאֵלִים, i.e. 'of the Ishmaelites,' 'of the Jerahmeelites.' The latter is the origin of the forms containing ח (cp. מַחֲלוּ, מחלי); the former, of those containing ע. So in Ps. ix. עַל־מוֹת לְבֹן (see 18) should be לְבַנֵּי יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים, 'of the Ishmaelites.' The 'Ishmaelites' or 'Jerahmeelites' are singers (see p. xxii.). The title שִׁיר לַמַּעֲלוֹת may be more correct than שִׁיר הַמ'; it probably means, 'Of Asshur: of Ishmael' (see 30), two alternative titles combined, both assigning the psalm to a Jerahmeelite guild.

2. *Al-tašḥeth* (אֶל־תַּשְׁחֵת), lvii., lviii., lix., lxxv., and *Aiyeleth haš-šāḥar*, upon (עַל־אֵיֶלֶת הַשָּׁחַר), xxii. The former from אֶל־אַשְׁחֹר, 'of Ashḥur'; the latter from אֶל־יִרְחַמְאֵל־אַשְׁחֹר, 'of Jerahmeel-ashḥur.'

3. *Asaph*, of (לְאַסָּף), l., lxxiii.-lxxxiii. Asaph = Abiasaph, certainly a N. Arabian name, to be grouped with Saph (2 S. xxi. 18), Joseph,<sup>1</sup> and perhaps Shaphat, Šephath, Sarephath.<sup>2</sup> On the analogy of אַבִּיתָר, Abiasaph = Arāb-asaph. In Ex. vi. 24, 1 Chr. ix. 19, xxvi. 1 (reading בֶּן אַבִּיסָף), we find Abiasaph (the best vocalization) a Korhite, while in 1 Chr. vi. 39 (cp. v. 43) Asaph is a Gershomite. Now גֵּרְשֹׁם is closely connected with אַשְׁחֹר = גֵּרְשֹׁם; for 'Korhite' see 12. In Ezr. ii. 41 (Neh. viii. 44) 'the singers, the benē Asaph' are grouped with families certainly N. Arabian (see *Crit. Bib.*). The *benē haš-šōārīm* come next, or rather the *benē asshurim*, i.e. the Asshurites (see 10); in Ex. vi. 24 a brother of Abiasaph is called אַסִּיר, doubtless a corruption of

<sup>1</sup> One of the benē Asaph, in 1 Chr. xxv. 2, 9, is called 'Joseph.'

<sup>2</sup> Cp. the intermediate form סַפְרָת, Neh. vii. 57; also אַסְפָּסָף, Num. xi. 4, probably from צַפְתִּים = אַסְפָּסָף (*Crit. Bib.*).

Next come the *Nethinim*, *i.e.* the Ethanites, and the *benê 'abdê šelōmo*, or rather the *benê 'arāb-šalamu*. All these are probably temple-singers (see p. xxii.), and certainly N. Arabian.

4. *David*, of (לְדָוִד), prefixed to all the psalms of Bk. i. except i., ii., x., xxxiii.; to 21 in Bk. ii.; to 1 in Bk. iii.; to 2 in Bk. iv.; and to 17 in Bk. v.; in all to 78. [Ps. xcvi. should perhaps be added.] Lagarde takes a step in the right direction when he says, 'One division of the temple choir could be named after David, another after Heman, or Korah, or any one else, just as English professors can be called Margaret, or Savilian, or Hulsean, &c.' It is most probable, however, that the other names in phrases like לְדָוִד are Negeb clan-names. Now, though there may have been a clan-name Dōd, it is not to be expected here; the clan to which such a large number of psalms was assigned must have borne a more important name than Dōd. We have, as it seems, a triple clue to the meaning of לְדָוִד. (a) In Pss. xvi., lvi.-lx. לְדָוִד goes with מַכְתָּם, *i.e.* מַעֲכָתִים, 'Maacathites,' a gloss on דָּוִד. See 16. (b) Pss. xxxix. and lxii. have the double title לִידִיתָן or עַל־יִדִיתָן and לְדָוִד, and Ps. lxxi. (lxx.) in G's Hebrew text may have had the double title לְדָוִד and in a corrupt form לְבִנֵי יִדִיתָן (υἱων ἰωυδαβ). (c) Ps. xlv. in the second part of its title has יִדִיתָן, which probably comes from לִידִיתָן, *i.e.* לְעַרְבֵי אֵיתָן (see 10). We may plausibly assign the same origin to לְדָוִד, the intermediate stage being לִידִיתָן. It should be noticed that in lxxii. 20 עַרְבֵי אֵיתָן comes from בְּנֵי יִשְׁמַעֲאֵל, which is a gloss on אֵיתָן [M דָּוִד], and that in cxliv. 10 אֶת־דָּוִד is an intrusive and incorrect gloss on עַבְדּוֹ. Observe that in the titles of xviii. and xxxvi. יְהוָה לְעַבְדּוֹ is a corruption of יְהוָה לְעַרְבֵי יִשְׁמַעֲאֵל; לְדָוִד follows. The conjecture that דָּוִד ultimately comes from עַרְבֵי אֵיתָן is thus confirmed.

5. *Ethan the Ezrahite*, of (לְאֵיתָן הָעֶזְרָחִי), lxxxix. How can Ethan the Levite also be an Ezrahite or Zarhite, *i.e.* a Judahite (see p. xxxvii.)? The question has wrong pre-suppositions, which need not here be examined. Ethan the Ezrahite, in 1 K. v. 11 [iv. 31] is the name and title of a foreign sage; in 1 Chr. ii. 6 he is made a son of Zerah (cp. Gen. xxxviii. 30). Zerah, too, occurs as a Cushite and Edomite name (see *E. Bib.*, 'Zerah'). The

<sup>1</sup> *Orientalia*, ii. 23. Zenner accepts this view (*Zt. f. kath. Theol.* xv. 361 f. [1891]); König (*Einleit.*, p. 395) rejects it.

origin of Zerah or Ezraḥ is no doubt אֶשְׁחור (the name of a district or districts in the N. Arabian border-land. Read לאיתן האשחורי, *i.e.* 'assigned) to the Ashhurite Ethan (clan).'

6. *Gittith*, upon the (עַל־הַגִּתִּית), viii., lxxxi., lxxxiv. Either from עַל־הַגִּתִּית, or directly from עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית, for which see 26.

7. *Heman the Esrahite*, of (לְהִימָן הָאֶזְרָחִי), lxxxviii. To be explained on the analogy of 5. 'Heman,' of course, is a clan-name. In 1 K. v. 11 (iv. 31) Heman is a son of Mahol, *i.e.* a Jerahmeelite, but in 1 Chr. ii. 6 he is a son of Zerah = Ezraḥ. הִימָן is either a corruption of תִּימָן (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Heman'), or, better, of אַחִימָן (Ahiman), Num. xiii. 22, cp. 1 Chr. ix. 17, where it is the name of a family or guild of the temple-ministers called שְׁעָרִים ('porters'), or rather אֶשְׁרִים (Asshurites). Now תִּימָן is probably formed from תִּיָּמָן, and אַחִימָן is an early corruption of יִרְחָמָל. יִמָּן and יִרְחָ being identical, the title describes Ps. lxxxviii. as assigned to a Jerahmeelite or Asshurite clan named (probably) אַחִימָן.

8. *Hallelujah* (הַלְלִיָּהּ). The difficulties already mentioned suggest that the word is corrupt. Comparing הִלַּל (Isa. xiv. 12) and מְהַלְלָאֵל (Gen. v. 12), we may trace its origin to לִירְחֻמָּאֵלִים.

9. *Higgaion* (הִגְּגִיֹּן), ix. 17, followed by שְׁלֵה, and xcii. 4, followed by בְּכִנּוֹר. Both passages are corrupt (vol. i., pp. 33, 36; vol. ii., p. 87).

10. *Jedi(u)thun*, of, or, upon (לְיִדְיֹתוֹן, xxxix. ; עַל־יְדֻתוֹן, lxii. ; עַל־יְדִיתוֹן, lxxvii.) ; *Loves, Song of* (שִׁיר יְדִידֹת), xlv. Jeduthun(?) is mentioned with Asaph and Heman in 1 Chr. xxv. 1 ff., 2 Chr. v. 12, xxxv. 15, and with Heman alone in 1 Chr. xvi. 41, thus taking the place of Ethan (cp. 1 Chr. xv. 17). Clearly either יְתוֹן or יְתָן must represent אֵיתָן; how, then, shall we explain יְדֹ or יְדִי? Lagarde (*Uebersicht*, 121) supposes that the right phrase was עַל־יְדֵי אֵיתָן, 'to be performed (or, preserved) through (or, by) the guild, or choir, of Ethan.' But then how shall we account for the phrase בְּנֵי יְדֻתוֹן (1 Chr. xvi. 42)? The clue is suggested by the fact that names both of clans and of persons often consist of two names of districts or clans combined. Notable instances are, 1. Obed-edom, who in 1 Chr. xvi. 38 is called a son of Jedithun, and whose name should rather be read Arab-edom (or Arab-aram); 2. 'abdē selōmō (Ezra ii. 55 = Neh. vii. 57), rather 'Arab-šalamu (see p. xxii.); and 3. Rab-šakeh, 2 K. xviii.

17, rather Arab-cush. יָדִים almost certainly comes either from אָרָם (= יָרָח) or from עָרַב. The latter alternative is here adopted (cp. on בִּידִי, Ps. cxli. 6). The benê Jeduthun were, according to 1 Chr. xvi. 42, 'at the gate' (לְשַׁעֲרֵי), i.e. 'door-keepers,' שַׁעֲרִים; but there is clearly some misunderstanding connected with these 'door-keepers.' Most probably the original designation of the benê Jeduthun (or, Arab-ethan), as well as of the benê Shallum (Ezra ii. 42) was אַשּׁוּרִים, 'Asshurites' (cp. 3).

- That יְדוּתָן or יִדְיָתָן really comes from אֵיתָן is confirmed by the titles of xviii. and xxxvi. (see 4; end). Observe that in the title of c. לְדוּתָן has become לְתוּדָה. See also 4, 13, and 28. Lastly, as to יִדְדָת. Shîr and Jedîdôth are brought together by a mistake. יִדְדָת is a corruption of יִדְיָתָן [ל];<sup>1</sup> cp. the combination of לְדוּד and לִיד referred to under 4. For שִׁיר, see 30. 'Song of loves' (or, 'love') is quite unsuitable.

11. *Jonath-elem-rehokim, upon* (עַל־יוֹנָת אֵלֶם רְהוֹקִים) lvi. Cp. *E. Bib.*, s. v. That עַל־יוֹנָת comes from עַל־נְגִינֹת (cp. liv. f., lxi.), is obvious. Nor can we hesitate under אֵלֶם רַח to see אֶל־הַקְּרָחִים, 'to the Korhites.' See 11.

12. *Korah, of the sons of* (לְבָנֵי קָרַח) xlii., xliv.-xlix., lxxxiv. f., lxxxvii. f. The origin of the southern clan Korah is variously traced to Esau and to Caleb (see *Enc. Bib.*, s. v.). The key to the name is furnished by 1 Chr. xii. 6, where הַקְּרָחִים interrupts the list of names, and has evidently come in from the margin, where it stood as a variant to בְּנֵי יֶרַח (v. 7, end). Cp. also Num. xvi. 1, 'Korah, ben Izhar [from Ashhur], ben Kehath [from Maacath].' The sum of the matter is that קָרַח (in which Hebrew wit may have seen 'baldness')<sup>2</sup> is a distortion of יֶרַח = יֶרַח־מַאֲל. The distortion, however, obtained an independent existence. The clan of the benê Kōrah were originally, of course, not 'door-keepers,' but first Asshurites (cp. 9) and then singers. Thus the questions asked on p. xxxvi. are answered.

13. *Mahalath, upon.* See 1.

14. *Maschil* (מִשְׁכִּיל) xxxii., xlii., xliv. f., lii.-lv., lxxiv., lxxviii., lxxxviii. f., cxlii. An examination of the titles shows that it stands in close relation to לְמִנְצָח. In *Enc. Bib.*, 'Maschil,' it is

<sup>1</sup> So already Staerk (*ZATW*, xii. 136), with יִדְיָתָן as an alternative original.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. ii. 23, xxv. 23.



suggested that it may be a corruption of the same word that underlies למנ' viz. perhaps לְמִשְׁכָּן (see 19). More probably, however, it comes from למשך, i.e. לְכָשֶׁם, 'of Cusham.' This would be a gloss on the abridged composite title למנצח.

15. *Memorial, to make* (R.V. מְגִלָּה; or 'to be sung at the presentation of the Azkārā (Del., Bāthgen), or 'to confess [sin]' (B. Jacob).<sup>1</sup> Corrupt. Read לְאַשְׁחֹר; cp. השחר, xxii., title (see 2).

16. *Michtam* (מִכְתָּם), xvi., lvi.-lx. G (B א &c.), in Isa. xxxviii. 9 gives προσευχή, and G<sup>1</sup> ᾠδή, προσευχή, for M's מִכְתָּם. This may point to תְּהַנֵּן (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Michtam'); cp. חֲנֻכָּה, xxx., title. It is easier, however, to suppose that מִכְתָּם comes from מַעֲבָתִים; cp. מַעֲבַת מִכֹּת from 2 Chr. ii. 9 (see *Crit. Bib.* on 1 Chr. v. 25). מִכְתָּם is always combined with דָּוִד, on which, or rather perhaps on אֵיתָן, it appears to be a gloss. That is, 'Arab-ethan' is equivalent to 'Maacathites.' See 4.

17. *Moses, the man of God, of* (לְמֹשֶׁה אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים), xc. Read לִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים [ירחמאלים]. See vol. ii., pp. 75 f.

18. *Müth-labben, upon.* See 1.

19. *Musician, to the chief* (Kautzsch, *dem Musikmeister*; לְמִנְצֵחַ). Prefixed to fifty-five psalms, and mostly followed by לְדָוִד (lxvi. and lxvii. are exceptional); also in the subscription of Habakkuk's prayer (Hab. iii. 19; see *Crit. Bib.*, p. 171). The older explanations being altogether inadequate, we must look further. Two courses are open to us. 1. It would be natural that the word or words expressing the assignment of a psalm to a certain singing-guild should be introduced by a word which certified the due transference of the psalm to the temple authorities. Such a word would be לְמִשְׁכָּן, 'as a thing deposited' = 'to be laid up in store' (an Aramaism). 2. The evidence that the titles are largely made up of N. Arabian ethnics or clan-names, borne by the singing-guilds, has, however, increased so much, and we have also now so much more proof of the existence of compound names like Obed-edom (from 'Arab-aram'), that we can hardly doubt that מִנְצֵחַ comes from [חִי]מִן־חֲצָר, i.e.

It will then appear that 'למן' and 'על-אילת השחר' in the title of Ps. xxii. mean the same thing, *i.e.* the abridged form 'למנצה' was followed by a gloss conveying the name accurately.

20. *Negînōth*, with (בְּנִינֹת), iv., vi., liv. f., lxvii., lxxvi., Hab. iii. 19 (with superfluous ' attached), and once (lxi.) *on Neginath* (עַל-נִינִית), but G Σ J T imply (בְּנִינִית). If 'למנצה' means 'to the director of music' it is natural to explain 'בכנ' 'with the music of stringed instruments.' This makes a weak explanation of 'למ' still weaker; how superfluous to admonish the director! There must have been editorial manipulation. Some indistinct word was converted into 'נגינות', and 'על' (אל) was then (except in lxi.) altered into 'ב'. In vi. 'בכנ' is followed by 'על-השמינית', which was no doubt originally a correction of 'בכנ', but is not the original phrase. See 26.

21. *Nehilōth*, on the. See 1.

22. *Praise* (תְּהִלָּה). See vol. ii., p. 233.

23. *Prayer* (תְּפִלָּה), xvii., lxxxvi., xc., cii., cxlii. Cp. lxxii. 20.

24. *Psalm* (מִזְמֹר). 'מ' is an unexplained word. As in the case of 'למנצה', two courses are open. 1. Considering (*a*) that the normal position of 'מִזְמֹר' appears to be either before or after the formula stating to which singing guild the particular psalm was assigned, we may assume that 'מז' is a corruption of some word stating that the psalm was duly admitted or inscribed. And considering (*b*) that from xlvi. onwards 'מִזְמֹר' shows a very strong tendency to associate itself with 'שיר', we may plausibly assume that 'שיר' is a fragment of the word which is the true original of 'מִזְמֹר'. The word that will occur to most is 'רשום' 'marked' (Dan. ix. 21); see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Psalms.' The strongest objection to this is that 'למנצה' is most probably a corruption of a compound district-name, and that if 'רשום' meant 'marked,' we should expect to find it sometimes prefixed to 'למן' (*i.e.*, 'ירחמאל-אשחור'). 2. The second course is to seek for the district- or clan-name out of which the corruption 'מִזְמֹר' may have arisen, and our clue is the observation that 'מז' and 'שיר' are closely related, and that the easiest explanation of 'שיר' (see on 'שור', Ps. xviii. 30 *b*, and *Crit. Bib.* on 'שיר', 2 S. i. 18) is to regard it as a slightly corrupt fragment of 'אשיר'. It will thus appear that 'שיר מִזְמֹר' (so xlvi., lxvi., lxxxiii., lxxxviii., cviii.) represents 'שיר מִזְמֹר שיר', while 'שיר מִזְמֹר' (so lxv.,

lxvii. f., lxxv. f., lxxxvii.) represents אשור 'ל[ירח], 'of Jerahmeel-asshur.'

25. *Selah* (סֶלָה). The learned ingenuity of critics having been baffled, we are driven to suppose that the text of the 74 passages containing סֶלָה (see p. xl.) is corrupt.<sup>1</sup> (a) סֶלָה might conceivably represent some word embodying a direction to the scribe, such as יְשִׁלֵּם, 'supplement,' or לְשִׁלֵּם, 'for supplementing.' If so, the word either directs the scribe to supplement a defective place in the MS., or intimates that an insertion has been made. It might also be conjectured that the traditional Jewish interpretation (סֶלָה = עלם or לעלם) arose out of an early corruption of שלם or לשלם. (b) Considering, however, the frequency\* of corruptions of אלהים and of ירחמאל, and observing that מ and ס are liable to confusion, it seems more probable that סֶלָה, which apparently forms part of the text, and certainly never occurs in a title, comes in some cases from אלהים, and in others from ירחמאל. An examination of the 74 passages confirms this idea. Probably the last editor, finding סֶלָה written by mistake (for אלהים) in Ps. iii. 3, 5, 9, jumped to the conclusion that it was an ancient technical term connected with the liturgical service, and scrupulously retained סֶלָה wherever he found it, especially at the end of a verse.<sup>2</sup>

26. *Sheminith, on the* (עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית), vi., xii. Now that we have found how often שֶׁמֶן is a corruption of יִשְׁמַעֵל = ישמעאל (see on xcii., l. 17, vol. ii., p. 88). The original of this and the related phrases (see 6, 11, 20, 27, 28) is אֶל-יִשְׁמַעֲאֵלִים.

27. *Shiggaion* (שִׁגְיוֹן), vii.; plural, with עַל prefixed, in Hab. iii. 1. A corruption of שְׁמִינִית (מ = גי); see 26.

28. *Shōshannim, upon* (עַל־שִׁשְׁנִים), xlv., lxix.; *Shōshannim-ēdūth, upon* (עַל־שִׁשְׁנִים עֵדוּת), lxxx.; *Shūshan-ēdūth, upon* (אֶל-שִׁשְׁ עֵדוּת), lx. שֶׁשֶׁן and שוֹשֵׁן are corruptions directly or indirectly of יִשְׁמַעֲאֵלִים (see 26), and עֵדוּת of יִרְתֹּן (see 10).

29. *Solomon, of* (לְשִׁלְמוֹה), lxxii., cxxvii. Either from 'of Shalamu' (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Salmah'), or better, from אֵל 'of Ishmael.'

<sup>1</sup> Grimme was the first to suspect that סֶלָה might be sometimes due to textual corruption.

<sup>2</sup> In lv. 20, lvii. 4, Hab. iii. 3, 9 סֶלָה occurs, abnormally, in the middle of a verse.

30. *Song* (שִׁיר), in the titles of thirty psalms, also (שִׁירָה) in Ps. Sol. xv., xvii. (titles). On origin, see 24. For 'song of degrees,' see 6 ; for 'song of loves,' see 9.

31. *To teach* (לְלַמֵּד), lx., and 2 S. i. 18. Either a dittograph of לָדוֹר (Renan), or, better, miswritten for לִירְחֻמֶּאֱל.

To this may for completeness be added (a) an extremely probable correction of אֲשֶׁר־שָׁר לִיהוָה, 'which he sang to Yahwè,' in Ps. vii., title, viz. לִירְחֻמֶּאֱל אֲשֶׁר, 'of Jerahmeel-asshur'; and (b) the probable restoration of the original text of the subscription in lxxii. 20, where דוד בְּרִישִׁי has come from [בְּנֵי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל] עָרַב אִיתָּו. It is too superficial an explanation of M's text that the corrupt reading לָדוֹר in the titles had arisen before the subscription referred to was inserted (cp. pp. xliii., lxxv.).

The words or phrases which have been considered relate generally, as one can hardly help believing, to the singing guilds. There are also portions of the titles which, in their original form, appear to contain suggestions as to the contents of the psalms ; to this we will return presently. It is proper to remark here that from the preceding conspectus of results it would appear that the current historical view of the development of the guilds of singers cannot be adhered to. That the singers originally called benê Asaph gradually split up into many families, some of which called themselves with special emphasis benê Asaph, others benê Jedithun, others benê Heman, is a conjecture entirely based on questionable readings of the traditional text. There is no reason why there should not have been, from the very beginning of the services in the second temple, several guilds of singers. The title benê Asaph seems to have been specially favoured, but this does not prove that it was the original title of the collective body of singers. We have seen already (p. xlii.) that Abiasaph was sometimes described as a Korhite ; and it is not at all likely that there was a time when there were Asaphite but no Korhite singers. Asaph is also described as a Gershomite, *i.e.* an Asshurite, and this reminds us that the titles of Pss. lxxv. f. connect 'Asaph' with 'Shir,' *i.e.* Asshur. It is probable too that the title חֲמִשָּׁה־בָּנִים, prefixed to בְּנֵי אָסָף in Ezra ii. 41, was originally intended to refer to the בְּנֵי הַשְּׁעִרִים (rather אֲשֻׁרִים), the נִיתִינִים (rather אִיתִינִים) and the בְּנֵי עֶרְבַּי שְׁלֵמָה (rather בְּנֵי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל) ; *i.e.*, all

these clans were devoted to the service of song. If there was any general term for the singers other than **המשררים**, it was probably (as we may infer from the titles of the Psalms) 'Asshur-jerahmeel,' or 'Jerahmeelites,' or 'Ishmaelites.' The last of these names has also perpetuated itself (in a disguised form) in the title of a later collection of psalms, the so-called **ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος**<sup>1</sup> (see pp. lxiii. f.). Arab-ethan, however, is little less widely spread as the title of a great singing guild or company; the name 'Ethan' was subsequently disguised as 'Nethinim' (see p. xxii.). The Korhites (Korahites) may perhaps have been a different guild, though in 2 Chr. xx. 19 the Kohathites and Korhites seem to stand for the singers. But all these names, when closely examined, turn out to come from the Negeb, or N. Arabian border-land, and to be, genealogically, closely related.

§ 14. We now return to those portions of the titles which, if our criticism is correct, originally referred to the contents of the psalms. I may venture to remind the reader that again and again elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> when speaking of O. T. narratives and prophecies, I have maintained that these have been altered from earlier narratives and prophecies, partly misread, partly misinterpreted, so that they present historical and geographical statements widely differing from those originally conveyed. These transformed passages are analogous to the transformed psalm-titles. If by taking this course I help to rehabilitate the authors or supplementers of the titles, this can hardly be reckoned to my discredit. Such harsh criticisms have been passed on the supposed unintelligence of the unfortunate editors of the psalms that a plausible critical defence of them may appeal to those who can put aside prejudice, and look at facts with a single eye. The reader will doubtless supplement this conspectus by a reference to the translation and notes.

(a) Ps. iii. At the approach of the sons of Arabia and the sons of Ishmael.

(b) Ps. vii. With reference to the Arabians, the Cushites, and the sons of Yaman.

(c) Ps. xviii. The words of Israel in the day that Yahwè

<sup>1</sup> Cp. **משלי שלמה**, Prov. x. 1, xxv. 1, *i.e.*

<sup>2</sup> See *Critica Biblica*, Parts i.-iv., and articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

delivers him from the hand of all the Arabians and from Jerahmeel [Ishmael].

(d) Ps. xxxiv. When Maacath, the benê Arab-jerahmeel, and Ashhur are plucked up.

(e) Ps. li. Concerning the house of Ishmael.

(f) Ps. lii. Concerning the house of Jerahmeel.

(g) Ps. liv. (Concerning) the Zarephathites [Jerahmeel].

(h) Ps. lvi. (Concerning) the Jerahmeelites.

(i) Ps. lvii. (Concerning) the Jerahmeelites [the benê Ishmael].

(k) Ps. lix. (Concerning) the Ishmaelites and the benê Jerahmeel.

(l) Ps. lx. At the oppression + of Israel + by Aram-jerahmeel and Aram-miṣṣōr.

(m) Ps. lxiii. When he (the guild of Arāb-ethan) was in the wilderness of Jerahmeel.

(n) Ps. cxlii. When he (the guild of Arāb-ethan) was in Jerahmeel.

(o) Ps. cxliii. When the benê Arāb-ishmael pursued. (Based on lxx.)

(p) Ps. cxliv. Concerning the captivity. (Based on lxx.)

The single traditional element retained is the assumption (surely a necessary one) that the second part of the titles of these psalms describes the occasion of the psalms. According to the earlier tradition this occasion had to do with the N. Arabian oppression. Space will only allow us to give some explanatory hints; the reader will, of course, have taken some pains to enter into the point of view from which the text of the psalms has here been revised.

(a) It is assumed that here as elsewhere פני represents בני; אבשלום is a combination of ערב and ישמעאל. ברח comes from קרב. (b) על-עריבים וְכֹשִׁים וּבְנֵי יִמָן. Or, יָשׁוּ:

[בְּנֵי יִמָן]. ערב and דבר are sometimes confounded. (c)

דבר is no more a part of the appendix to the title than

אשר-שר in Ps. vii.; see 'Corrigenda in Titles,' (6).

ישראל are redactional. השירה comes from ישראֵל. עריבים=איביו (cp. on vii. 9). יד, as elsewhere, may be a fragment of ירחמאל; מכב and מיד together are improbable.

of course, = ישמעאל. (d) Read ערב-ירחמאל.

זעכת ובני ערב-ירחמאל. ואשחור. It is the *anticipated* uprooting of Jerahmeel. ילך comes from ירחמאל, a correction perhaps of מלך. (The personal

name אבימלך is a popular distortion of 'ערב ירח'. (e) בת for בית, as in Isa. x. 32. שבע, like שמע, = 'שמ'. The rest is redactional. (f) ירחמאל = אחימלך. Expansion again. (g) Both צרפתים and הזיפים represent עמנו may come directly from עמון. But even if so, its indirect origin is ירחמאל. (h) באחו comes from ירחמאל = מאחר. ז and ר confounded; באחו suggested to the latest editor connecting the psalm with the story in 1 S. xxi. 10 ff. (i) [ב]ברחו and [ב]נערה both = ירחמאל. בני ישמי = בני ש'. (k) בשלח, שאול, and וישמרו may all have arisen out of defective forms of 'שמ'. בית להמיתו may represent בית-ירחמאל. (l) See vol. i., p. 260. (m) יהודה, mis-written for 'ירח, i.e. ירחמאל (see *Crit. Bib.* on Judg. xix. 1. (cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 1 S. xxii. 1). (o) ὁ αὐτὸν εἰς

αὐτὸν εἰς

(p) G<sup>B</sup>, πρὸς τὸν Γολιαθ (Γολιαθ, T) ;

§ 15. It will be a relief to many minds to discover how such a strange thing as the assignment of a large number of extremely pious songs to David came to pass. We have no occasion to resort to the ingenious but artificial hypothesis that one of the minor Psalters bore the name 'David,' and that, when the true significance of the title was forgotten, the psalms in the collection were supposed to be all the work of David, and so received the superscription *l'dāwīd*. The true cause of the phenomenon was that the name Jeduthun or Jedithun was difficult to transcribers, and, supposing that the corrupt word which lay before him in the different headings, where (as is now very probable) Jeduthun should have stood, must represent some well-known name, the last editor converted it, wherever it occurred, into *l'dāwīd*, without thinking of the historical improbability of the view of David thus produced. His real reason was that a badly written דות or דית (a fragment of ידותן or ידיתן) approached more nearly to דוד than to any other known personal name. But he may also have thought of the tradition of the musical skill of David in 1 S. xvi. 16, 23 ; and though the songs ascribed to David in 1 and 2 Sam. are not religious, yet in post-exilic times David became such a saint that it is to him rather than to Solomon the idolater that the Chronicler assigns the preparations for the building of the temple, and, among other internal arrangements, those relating to the music (see 1 Chr. xxiii. 5, xxv. 1, 2 Chr. viii. 14, xxix. 25). This does not, of course, prove much as regards the

date of the last editor, for the point of view represented by the Chronicler can neither have begun with him, nor have ceased after his time.

§ 16. It is strange, but true, that the belief in Davidic and, in general, pre-exilic psalms but slowly disappears. Vatke in 1835 suggested that 'single songs may have survived in the mouth of the people, and in an altered shape have passed into our Book of Psalms, or at least have exerted an influence as ancient models.'<sup>1</sup> It is indeed intelligible that some critics, jealous for the honour of early Israelitish religion, should declare themselves unable to form a satisfactory picture of pre-exilic religion without some distinct evidences that the teaching of the prophets had begun to produce in individuals a sense of personal communion with God. It is also intelligible that the discovery of extremely early Babylonian hymns should have awakened a desire to be able to point to comparatively early Israelitish hymns, and that the modern longing to find organic development everywhere should have produced in some critics an inclination to be somewhat easy in the matter of evidence for early Israelitish hymns, which must, as they rightly assume, have been produced, and have influenced the form, if not the ideas, of the later psalms.

The grounds on which even such a scholar as Prof. Kautzsch still maintains the existence of some pre-exilic psalms in our Psalter appear to be three in number.<sup>2</sup> 1. The references to a king in Pss. xx., xxi., xlv. 2. The 'energetic denial of the necessity of the sacrificial ritual' in xl. 7, l. 8 ff., li. 18 f. 3. The 'manifold traces of antique phraseology' in the Psalms. The first of these grounds has, from a conservative textual point of view, been much weakened by G. B. Gray's able essay on the Royal Psalms. The second involves the rejection of the very plausible theory that different views were taken in post-exilic times as to the origin and importance of the sacrificial cultus. Such differences, however, are to be found in other great religions (e.g. Brahmanism, Zoroastrianism, Christianity); why not also in early Judaism? No one would be so unwise as to suggest that any of the psalmists, at any rate if temple-singers, were directly opposed to the sacrificial system; but there were probably not a few psalmists who wrote with a view to the synagogue-worship, and, even apart

<sup>1</sup> *Die Religion des A.T.*, i. 291 ff. Vatke was answered by De Wette in a famous article in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* for 1837.

<sup>2</sup> *Outline of the Hist. of the Lit. of the O.T.* (1898), p. 143.



from this, no psalmist who had any affinity to Jeremiah (see Jer. vii. 22 f., viii. 8) could miss the sublime truth that obedience and thanksgiving were the true 'divine service.'<sup>1</sup> It is highly improbable that Prof. Kautzsch regards Dr. B. Jacob's treatment of psalms like xl., l., and li.<sup>2</sup> as adequate and satisfactory. Kautzsch does not deny the spiritualizing Jeremianic tone of these psalms; but he accounts for this by the theory that they arose before the priestly code, *i.e.* that they are of pre-exilic origin. Now, the theory of late pre-exilic psalms influenced by Jeremiah, to which in my former commentary I myself inclined, will not stand a close examination. Jeremiah's influence was felt not so much by his contemporaries as by posterity—a posterity which, to do honour to the spirit of prophecy, thought fit to expand largely the contents of the roll of Jeremiah's works. And with regard to the difficulty of conceiving how utterances of a non-sacrificial view of religion could have found admission into the larger Psalter, one may fairly ask how, after Pss. xl. and li. had been admitted into 'Davidic' collections,<sup>3</sup> and Ps. l. into a fasciculus of 'Asaphite' psalms, the psalms referred to could have been finally rejected by any editor. I may also express the opinion that the predilection of the guardians of religious classics for uniformity belongs to a more advanced stage of theological development.

With regard to the argument from 'antique' phraseology, one may admit its force provided that the facts can be established. Prof. Kautzsch speaks on one occasion of the '*arugo vetustatis*,'<sup>4</sup> which all the labours of editors could not remove from certain early psalms. But is this 'antique rust' genuine? Kautzsch himself would surely admit that 'antique' forms, ἄραιο λέγόμενα, &c., may often be due merely to accidents in the transmission of the texts, or even to affectation;<sup>5</sup> and his own very long list of corruptions in the text of the psalms (see *Die heil. Schrift*, 'Beilagen,' pp. 69 ff.), which might easily have been made considerably longer, detracts from the force of his remark.

<sup>1</sup> See *OP*, pp. 364-367, and cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Jeremiah,' § 4, end.

<sup>2</sup> *ZATW* (1897), xvii. 67, 273-279.

<sup>3</sup> For argument's sake I here admit the term 'Davidic.'

<sup>4</sup> *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1891, pp. 577 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Darmesteter asserts the 'archaism' of the Gāthās, as compared with the language of the Avesta, to be an affectation (*Le Zend-Avesta*, iii., Introd., p. xciii.).

§ 17. Prof. Kautzsch, however, has not exhausted the possible grounds for holding that there are pre-exilic psalms, or pre-exilic elements in psalms. It is Prof. Briggs to whom we may look for a completion of the round of arguments, so soon as his expected commentary has appeared. I think that some passages from an article<sup>1</sup> which, unlike most reviews, not merely states his opinion of the work reviewed, but also justifies his criticism by stating how he would himself treat the subject, are deserving of quotation. 'For some years,' he says, 'I have been working on the theory that there was a Director's Psalter [מְנִיחַ; see p. xxxviii.] made up by a selection from several earlier minor Psalters, and that this Director's Psalter is the real backbone of our present Psalter, about which the final editor grouped his entire material.' Of these minor Psalters the most important was one which bore the name 'David.'<sup>2</sup> He does not deny that some of the later psalms in M, as well as in G, were ascribed to David by a misunderstanding, but he holds that 'the great mass of the Davidic psalms in all the books were taken from a Davidic Psalter, not composed by David, but gathered together from different authors and periods of composition under David's name.'

With regard to the psalms of Asaph and the Korahites, Prof. Briggs regards it as important that they contain the psalms most commonly assumed to be Maccabean, which is adverse, though not exactly fatal, to the present writer's theory in *The Origin of the Psalter* that the second section of the Psalter originated before the third.

In Books iv. and v. he finds 'at least two minor Psalters, viz. the group of Pilgrim psalms,—all of the same pentameter measure, with a single exception which has been obtruded upon the group for liturgical reasons,—and a group of "Hallels" which were originally together, but which have been broken in two at the final arrangement of the Psalter. The Royal Psalm [see vol. ii., p. 89], which rivalled in length the Law Psalm, no. 119, has been broken up, while the Law Psalm has remained intact.' It seems to him, therefore, 'that we must allow a considerable interval for the composition of these psalms of

<sup>1</sup> Review of Cheyne's *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter* in *The New World*, June 1892, pp. 356 ff.

<sup>2</sup> This is also the view of Robertson Smith and Bickell, and has been described as 'probable' by the present writer (*OP*, p. 190) and more recently by Kautzsch.

the minor Psalters, the collection of these minor Psalters, and their comprehension and distribution in our present Books iv., v., and that the theory advocated in the book under review does not give sufficient time for this.

To the present writer, however, it appeared more bold than wise to hope for much result for the chronology of the Psalter from the study of the minor collections as such, and without in any way disregarding these, as Olshausen formerly and Bähgen quite recently did, it seemed still more important to form fresh groups of psalms for oneself by noting affinities of ideas, situation, and phraseology, and upon these to base working hypotheses as to the periods to which the members of the respective groups belonged. This principle has already been carried out by Ewald (*Psalmen*<sup>(3)</sup>, 1866), and was afterwards adopted by A. Rahlfs with reference to eleven psalms (xxii., xxv., xxxi., xxxiv. f., xxxviii., xl., xlix., lxxi., cii., cix.<sup>1</sup> To build theories of the chronology of the psalms primarily on considerations respecting the length of time required for the growth of the Psalter<sup>2</sup> by the inclusion of minor Psalters (or portions of them), is surely too hazardous, even if in addition to this we analyze the individual psalms with a view to tracing redactional modifications, and discovering elements of diverse origin pieced together by editors. For this might easily lead on to the assertion of a pre-exilic and even Davidic origin for certain psalms (or parts of psalms) which would be inconsistent with the most critical and defensible view of the history of Israel's religion.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> עני and עני in den Psalmen (1892). The date assigned by Rahlfs to these psalms is late in and soon after the Exile.

<sup>2</sup> Besides Drs. Briggs and Peters, Prof. Sanday deserves to be mentioned in this connexion (see his Bampton Lectures on Inspiration, 1893, pp. 256 f., 270 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Briggs writes thus: 'It seems to us that he [the present writer] has not given sufficient attention to the marks of earlier language, style, and religion in many of these psalms, and that a sound criticism still finds some psalms of David, more psalms of the prophetic period, and many exilic psalms, while the great mass of the Psalter will remain where Prof. Cheyne puts it,—in the Persian, Greek, and Maccabean period' (*New World*, June 1892, p. 359). It may, however, be permissible to quote the following remarks: 'From the point of view of the history of art, not less than from that of the history of religion, the supposition that we have Davidic psalms presents insuperable difficulties' (*Origin of Psalter*, pp. 192 f.). 'It is not unnatural to imagine a Davidic element in Pss. xviii. and lx. Only we must be on our guard against pleasant illusions. No concession can be made which a conservative of the old school would think worth accepting. The religious reorganization of the people in Ezra's time was too complete to allow any considerable influence to archaic liturgical formulae' (*Ibid.*, pp. 193 f.). As to psalms of the prophetic period, the present writer has, since 1889, never wavered. 'We have no sufficient grounds for thinking that the religious teaching of the higher prophets found any wide acceptance among the people' (*Enc. Bib.*, col. 2939).

§ 18. One admission, however, may be willingly made. It is plain that both Prof. Briggs and Dr. J. P. Peters<sup>1</sup> had a much fuller perception than I had myself of the amount of redactional mosaic work in the Psalter. At the same time, hardly any inquiry is more difficult than this. It is surely better to be too slow than too quick, and while by no means inclined to stationariness in the analysis of the psalms, I would suggest that there is a preliminary work of the utmost importance, not referred to by Prof. Briggs in his frank and interesting article, viz. the study of the text of the psalms with a view to seeing whether there is not an underlying text of a different character, which has been first of all corrupted in the early stages of its transmission, and then manipulated, to produce an edifying sense.

§ 19. I am afraid that this opens a rather unpleasing prospect. If the present inquiries are upon the whole rightly planned, and if the results are in any considerable degree correct, the current theories of the origin and growth of the Psalter will have to be largely reconstructed. If any reader is impatient to attempt this work, he will do well to start from some judicious statement of a not too 'advanced' character, such as that of the late Prof. Robertson Smith in his well-known article<sup>2</sup> (1886), and rewrite this in proportion as he has assimilated the new material. The stress laid in that work on the minor Psalters is no detriment to it for such a purpose, for the student must at any rate begin with these, though he must not stop short with them. Such a person must, however, remember that there are a number of groups, proved to be such not only by affinities of contents but by local juxtaposition, which are not referred to in that article. As in the case of the proverbs, psalms are sometimes put together which, by their general similarity, as well as by their juxtaposition, appear to come from the same source—a small collection of psalms. But an acquaintance with the details of the text-critical work is so all-important that I would rather not 'largely reconstruct' the theory of the growth of the Psalter until I can presume that students have sufficiently assimilated the new material.

§ 20. I venture, however, to present the patient reader with a sheaf of critical remarks. i. It has become even clearer than

<sup>1</sup> Article on the Psalter, *New World*, June 1893, pp. 287 f.

<sup>2</sup> The main part of this, sometimes condensed, sometimes expanded (with due notice of such expansion), will be found at the beginning of the article 'Psalms' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

before that the colophon in Ps. lxxii. 20 is 'a witness to the gradual enlargement of small psalm-collections.' We now find it at the end of a psalm bearing the title 'of Solomon,' but it must originally have been the subscription to a great collection, containing psalms called 'of David.' So at least one was wont to put the matter, the misplacing of the colophon being ascribed to a scribe's error.<sup>1</sup> Now, however—if the reader accepts my guidance—it is plain that it was no oversight, but a deliberate transference that took place. The colophon originally referred only to the 'Ethanitic Psalter' (so I would designate the collection of the earlier psalms entitled 'Of Arab-ethan') ; it was transferred to the end of Ps. lxxii., with a view to include that psalm (originally entitled 'of Ishmael'), and consequently the words, 'the sons of Ishmael,' were appended to 'Arab-ethan,' as a correction.

ii. It may further be noticed that the title לִירְחֵמֶאל אֲשֶׁחַר ('of Jerahmeel-ashhur'), which is probably to be substituted for the enigmatical לַמִּנְצָה, reminds us of the phrase traditionally misread as סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר (R.V., 'the book of Jasher'), but originally (as now appears) read as סֵפֶר אֲשֶׁחַר ('the book of Ashhur'). It is not impossible that both the Ethanite, the Korahite, and the Asaphite psalms, and also the three passages expressly quoted from the 'book' referred to in narratives (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Jasher'), came from the same collection of poems, which was placed under the guardianship of the singing guild, or guilds, of Jerahmeelites, Ishmaelites, or Ashhurites.

iii. The so-called 'Songs of Degrees' were, as the revised title ('[Of] Ashhur, [of] the Ishmaelites') may seem to suggest, entrusted to the custody of the guild or guilds of Ashhurites or Jerahmeelites. It is, however, just possible that not only a part, but the whole, of this group of psalms came from the sanctuary at Beth-ishmael (see pp. xix. f.). In this case the terms 'Asshur' and 'Jerahmeelites' in the headings would here possess a special meaning of their own.

iv. As to the 'Michtam' ['Maacathim'] psalms (xvi., lvi.-lx.), I doubt whether they are rightly viewed as having originally formed a little group of psalms.<sup>2</sup> Even from a conservative textual

<sup>1</sup> See *OP*, p. 8, where the parallel of the repeated וַיַּעֲבֹר in Jer. li. 64 is referred to.

<sup>2</sup> Delitzsch has summed up the external features which seem to him common to the Michtam-psalms (introd. to Ps. xvi.), and Prof. Briggs praises Duhm for grouping these psalms together (*New World*, March 1900, p. 176).

point of view there is no overpowering necessity for this, and the revised text does not encourage the supposition.

§ 21. v. On the Elohistie redaction of Pss. xlii.-lxxxiii. (*i.e.*, Book ii. and the first part of Book iii.), the last word has hardly yet been spoken. The facts, of course, are quite plain. 'Yahwè' occurs only 30 times in Book ii., 'Elohim' 164 times; 'Yahwè' only 13 times in Pss. lxxxiii.-lxxxiii., 'Elohim' 36 times. In Ps. l. 7 we even find, 'I am Elohim, thy Elohim,' instead of 'I am Yahwè, thy Elohim' (cp. lxxxi. 11). That this is not what the original psalmist wrote, appears from the facts, 1. that Ps. liii. is only another recension, with some peculiar variations, of Ps. xiv., and 2. that Ps. lxx. is a repetition of xl. 14-18 (except that the opening word is omitted), while the opposite change is only once made. Now, since there is no obvious reason why the editor of a large and comprehensive collection should have made this alteration only in Pss. xlii.-lxxxiii., we must suppose that there was a time when these psalms formed (or formed part of) an Elohistie Psalter. But what was the motive of the editor? It has been suggested by Lagarde that he destined this Psalter for the use of the Levites, who, at the time of the redaction, were not allowed to pronounce the name Yahwè, and most scholars are agreed so far as this—that the phenomenon stands in connexion with the increasing avoidance of the name Yahwè in the later period.<sup>1</sup> It is not clear, however, why the redactor, if reverence was his motive, left 'Yahwè' anywhere in the altered psalms, and it is equally strange that presumably late psalms, such as Pss. cx. and cxviii., are Yahwistic rather than Elohistie, that in Daniel's prayer and confession in the name of Israel (Dan. ix.) the name Yahwè occurs seven times, and that the Hebrew Sirach (though not as constantly as the Book of Proverbs) uses that divine name. The matter has, I think, to be reconsidered in view of a probable result of textual criticism, which will have to be expounded at some length in connexion with Gen. ii. 4b,<sup>2</sup> and which is referred to briefly in the 'Addenda' to Part iv. of *Critica Biblica*, viz. that the God of Israel was habitually called, at any rate in Judah and the Israelite territory in the Negeb, not only Yahwè, but also Yahwè-jerahmeel, and even Jerahmeel alone. The compound name indicates that there

<sup>1</sup> Dr. J. P. Peters, however, is confident that 'in most cases "Yahwè" is a later addition, due to a Yahwistic revision of Elohistie psalms' (*New World*, June 1893, p. 200).

<sup>2</sup> In the portion of *Critica Biblica* vol. ii. containing Genesis.

is but one God of Israel and Jerahmeel (*i.e.* of the land of Israel in Palestine proper and in the Negeb), which, considering that Israel learned the worship of Yahwè in the N. Arabian border-land, certainly does appear to be in accordance with history. The Negeb was in fact Israel's Holy Land; there (as textual criticism tends more and more to show) were its earliest and most venerated sanctuaries, and thence came its most ancient legends. It is not strange then that some of the pre-exilic writers should have used Jerahmeel or Yahwè-jerahmeel (editorially changed into Elohim and Yahwè-elohim) as names of Israel's God, nor need it surprise us if some of the redactors of psalms<sup>1</sup> used as a divine name, not only Yahwè, but Elohim, *i.e.* the name which in later times was a current adaptation of, and substitute for, Jerahmeel. 'Elohim' might indeed be a name for 'the Deity,' but its use in the Old Testament where we might have expected Yahwè most probably arises, not in general from a reverent objection to limiting the universal Sovereign, but from an attachment to a name which reminded men of the ancient Holy Land. And the change of 'Jerahmeel' into 'Elohim' is to be accounted for by the growing repugnance of faithful Jews to the corrupt heathenish cultus of the very large non-Jewish portion of the population of the Negeb. This may be enough—not indeed to satisfy the natural curiosity of the reader—but to open the door for a consideration of the possibility that the Elohistic redaction of a large group of psalms can be accounted for by more concrete facts than has hitherto been supposed, and that 'Elohim' in these psalms (like Šebā'oth in Yahwè Šebā'ōth) is virtually a proper name, and not an abstract term for deity, used in place of a name for Him in whom all true Godship is centred.<sup>2</sup>

§ 22. vi. A widely-held theory respecting the relation of 'the Chronicler' to the Psalter also needs a reference here. Must we really hold that Pss. xcvi., cv. 1-15, cvi. 1, 47 f., also cxxxii. 8-10 were known to the Chronicler? As generally expressed (see *e.g.* Strack, *Eintl.*<sup>(4)</sup> p. 119) this involves holding that Book iv. already existed when the Chronicler wrote. But the division between Books iv. and v. was probably not made till the final redaction of

<sup>1</sup> We must remember that the families of singers from which so many of our psalms come were most probably of Jerahmeelite (*i.e.* N. Arabian) origin. See pp. xxi. f., xlix. f.

<sup>2</sup> It is not denied that the psalms of the Elohim-Psalter originally had the name Yahwè rather than Elohim.

the Psalms, *i.e.* undoubtedly, till after the time of 'the Chronicler.' It is also less probable that the dividing doxology in Ps. cvii. 48 originally contained the words **וְאָמַר כָּל־הָעָם אָמֵן**, 'and let all the people say, Amen,' than that these words were taken, with one slight and necessary alteration, from 1 Chr. xvi. 36, where we read, at the close of the strange composite psalm, **וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָל־הָעָם אָמֵן**, 'and all the people said, Amen.' This at least is Wellhausen's view (Bleek's *Eintl.*<sup>(1)</sup> 506, n. 1), which, however, seems to need supplementing. It is probable (1) that the whole of the close of Ps. cvii.—viz., *ver.* 47 f.—is borrowed from 1 Chr. xvi. 35 f.<sup>1</sup> (beginning **וַיֹּאמְרוּ הוֹשִׁיעֵנו** and ending **וְיִחַל לִיהוָה** [rather **וְיִחַל־לִיהוָה**]), and (2) that both the close and the opening (*ver.* 1-5) are accretions on the main body of that psalm, which had been handed down in an incomplete form, and needed some such additions to make it usable. As a consequence, we cannot commit ourselves to the view that 1 Chr. xvi. 34 is borrowed from cvii. 1 (which may well be later than the Chronicler). The formula was a conventional one, and occurs in cvii. 1, cxviii. 1, cxxxvi. 1. Nor can we venture to assert positively that it was the Chronicler who copied xcvi., cv. 1-15 (see 1 Chr. xvi. 8-33) and cxxxii. 8-10 (see 2 Chr. vi. 41 f.). The books of Chronicles, like other books, passed under the hands of redactors, and it is very possible that the insertions from the Psalter referred to were made by one of these.<sup>2</sup> We cannot, therefore, safely use the critical argument which is often based on these insertions.

§ 23. vii. On the question of Maccabæan psalms I cannot be entirely silent. The keenest modern critics have admitted a considerable number of such psalms. Among the most recent may be mentioned Merx, who undertakes to show<sup>3</sup> that even in Book i. there are manifest traces of Maccabæan transformation of early psalms, whilst Ps. ii. itself is of the very latest period, and Duhm, who assigns Pss. xii.(?), xiii.(?), xxiv. c(?), xxxv., xli., lv., lxix. a, lxxiv., lxxvii., lxxix., lxxxiii., cxviii., cxlix., to the Maccabæan struggle, and a still larger number to the subsequent period. Certainly the text as it stands strongly favours a Maccabæan date

\* <sup>1</sup> This passage consists of a current liturgical prayer, and a liturgical benediction and doxology (similar to those placed by editors at the end of Books i., ii., and iii.).

<sup>2</sup> Similarly Reuss, Stade, and Duhm.

<sup>3</sup> *Festschrift zu Ehren von Daniel Chwolson*, 1899, pp. 198 ff.



for Pss. xlv. (xlv. *a*), lxxiv. (lxxiv. *a*), lxxix., and lxxxiii.<sup>1</sup>, unless indeed we see our way to follow Robertson Smith and assign these psalms to the imperfectly attested oppression of the Jews by Artaxerxes Ochus (see p. xxv.). It is true, Schechter objects<sup>2</sup> that the parallelisms between xlv. 19 and Sirach xlv. 11 *c*, and between lxxiv. 10 *f*, 13, and Sirach xxvi. 6 *f*. in the recently discovered Hebrew text exclude a Maccabæan date. Of these, the first is of no significance, and with regard to the others one might well suppose that the impassioned prayer in Sirach xxxvi. 1-17, together with xxxv. 18-20, was inserted during the Syrian oppression, for it is certainly unique in the Wisdom of Ben-Sira. And above all, the reader must be warned that the text of all these four psalms needs a searching examination before it can be used for critical purposes. Certainly I cannot deny the plausibility of the view that the Psalter as a whole was edited in the time of Simon the Maccabee, as a consequence of the re-dedication of the temple in B.C. 165, and that some psalms of very recent origin were then inserted. But I cannot point to these psalms. Throughout the Psalter there is a background, sometimes real, sometimes to a certain extent assumed, which is plainly N. Arabian. Nowhere can it be shown to be evident that the real enemies of the Jews are Syrian Greeks. It is nevertheless plausible to hold that in the later psalms this is the case, and that conscious archaism is responsible for the continued references to the N. Arabians. And supposing that Ps. ii. (untitled) was inserted as a preface to the 'Ethnic' Psalter, one might regard Ps. i. (also untitled) as the introduction to a large Psalter of the pre-Maccabæan Greek period, in which that smaller hymnal was included. To take up or to reject these hypotheses, however, would be inexpedient without a preliminary study of the text and contents of the psalms from our new point of view. I should like to add a caution against following those critics who deny the possibility of Maccabæan psalms on the ground that the Hebrew text of Ben Sira contains so many unbiblical words, idioms, and constructions. For the correctness of many parts of that text is liable to the greatest

<sup>1</sup> So Bâthgen, Kautzsch, and Cornill. König (*Einl.*, p. 403) can only recognize one Maccabæan psalm (lxxiv.). Driver (*Introd.*,<sup>(b)</sup> p. 385) stands nearer to Kautzsch than to König. The only member of the above group of four psalms which he omits is xlv., but, as a compensation, he includes doubtfully lxxxiii. Still, he allows (p. 389) the attractiveness of Robertson Smith's Ochus theory.

<sup>2</sup> *Wisdom of Ben Sira* (Cambridge, 1899), pp. 26, 37.

doubt, and those unbiblical elements may to a great extent be traced to deep-seated corruption of the text.<sup>1</sup>

§ 24. We must not digress to consider the other religious hymns and elegies contained in the Old Testament and, one might add, in the Apocrypha and the New Testament. But we cannot pass over the 'Psalms of Solomon.' This collection of eighteen psalms, written in Hebrew, and now only extant in a Greek version, contains the essence of Pharisaic Judaism, and has therefore been called by Ryle and James the 'Psalter of the Pharisees.' According to Duhm, there are also not a few Pharisaic psalms in our Psalter, and some of these, directed probably against Alexander Jannæus and his adherents, seem to him to have a striking resemblance to most of the 'Psalms of Solomon.'<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere he expresses surprise that the critics have not recognized how near chronologically the Davidic Psalter is to the Solomonic. Frankenberg,<sup>3</sup> too, has arrived at a somewhat similar result; only he assigns the Psalms of Solomon, together with a (large?) group of canonical psalms, to the period of the Syrian persecution. The existence of points of contact may be granted; but the canonical Psalter, much edited as it has been, contains nothing that can be compared with the language of the other Psalter on eschatology and on the Messianic expectation.<sup>4</sup> To this I must add that, in my judgment, Kusters is right<sup>5</sup> (against Frankenberg) in denying that there is any distinct reference in the Psalter of Solomon to contemporary history. The psalms appealed to by Frankenberg as proving a Maccabæan date, and by Wellhausen<sup>6</sup> as proving a reference to the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C., really refer, according to Kusters, to the catastrophe of 586 B.C.

On this subject I venture to agree with the Leyden critic, and I can therefore use the references to the capture of Jerusalem in the 'Psalms of Solomon' to illustrate Pss. lxxiv. and lxxix. But

<sup>1</sup> If Nöldeke (*ZATW*, xx. 84 ff. [1900]) errs at all, it is by understatement of the amount of corruption.

<sup>2</sup> *Psalmen*, 'Einleitung,' p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> *Die Datirung der Psalmen Salomos* (1896).

<sup>4</sup> See Charles, *Enc. Bib.*, 'Eschatology,' §§ 64, 66. With this general view Kirkpatrick agrees (*Psalms*, Introd., pp. xxxvii. f.).

<sup>5</sup> *De historische achtergrond van de Psalmen van Salomo* (Verslagen van de Koningl. Akad. van Wetenschappen, iv. 2), 1898.

<sup>6</sup> *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* (Beilage), 1874.

## INTRODUCTION.

it is doubtful whether we can stop short here. It seems probable that the writers of these psalms continue the tradition of the N. Arabian captivity and oppression.<sup>1</sup> For want of the Hebrew text we cannot finally prove this point; but our experience with the canonical Hebrew psalms hardly permits us to feel much uncertainty. The 'Psalms of Solomon' are highly imitative, and among the signs of this imitativeness we may surely recognize the heading of each of the psalms, *ψαλμὸς τῷ Σαλωμων*, i.e. *כּוֹמוֹךְ לְשִׁלְמָה*, which may have come from *לְיִשְׁמַעֵאל*, '[Of] Jerahmeel: of Ishmael' ('Ishmael' a gloss on 'Jerahmeel,' or *vice versa*). The alternative is to assume that the headings of the Hebrew psalms had been already corrupted, and that the collector thought it appropriate to put *mizmōr lišlōmō* by the side of *mizmōr lēdāwīd*. It is possible that some may prefer this view.<sup>2</sup> If, however, we grant that the so-called 'Psalms of David' have been much edited and manipulated, it is reasonable to presume that some manipulation was undergone by the 'Psalms of Solomon.' I confess that, just as *כּוֹשֵׁלִי שְׁלֹמָה* in Prov. x. 1, xxv. 1, has probably arisen out of *כּוֹשֵׁלִי יִשְׁמַעֵאל*, it seems to me that the heading *ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος* is most naturally accounted for by our former explanation. This implies bringing up the latest Psalter to a period not far removed from that of the canonical psalms.

§ 25. Another point in which the so-called 'Psalms of Solomon' continue an older tradition is that on the whole they represent the feelings of the personified community, or at least of its central point—the body of strict, law-observing Jews. This interpretation has for some time past been given by many

<sup>1</sup> In *Ps. Sol.* ii. 26 [30], where the death of the 'dragon' is related, *ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρεων Αἰγύπτου* may represent *עַל-הָרֵי מִצְרַיִם*, 'on the mountains of Miṣrim,' and *ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης* *יָמֵן* *עַל-אַרְצֵי יָמֵן*, 'on the land of Jaman (=Jerahmeel).' So, too, in *z.* 29 [33] *ἐγὼ κύριος γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης* may be based on a faulty text, which should have run, *אֲנִי אֲדֹנָי אֶרֶץ יָמֵן*, and in xvii. 15 [17] *ἐν μέσφ' ἐθνῶν συμμίκτων* may be a misinterpretation of *בְּתוֹךְ עַמֵּי עֲרָב*, 'amidst the peoples of Arabia.'

<sup>2</sup> The editor might have copied *כּוֹמוֹר*, and explained this as 'song.' The word occurs, at least if it is not a corruption, in the Heb. text of Sirach xlix. 1 (of secular songs; G, μ

critics<sup>1</sup> to the 'I' and 'me' of the canonical psalms; and though other critics prefer to hold that the 'I' and 'me' of many psalms indicate that in their original form these psalms were the effusions of individuals, which were adapted to more general use by omissions, additions, and other alterations, this view is by no means natural, and indeed cannot be applied to a strictly revised text. To compare the practice of those who prepare hymn-books for congregational Christian use is hardly permissible, the awakening of individual consciousness in the Western nations since the introduction of Christianity having no parallel in the Semitic East. Those hymns in the O.T. which were traditionally supposed to be the utterances of individuals (1 S. ii. 1-10, Isa. xxxviii. 10-20, Jon. ii. 2-9 [3-10]) turn out to be nothing of the kind, but simply expressions of the faith of the pious community of Israel. The same may on the whole be affirmed of the 'Psalms of Solomon.' The truth is that the controversy as to the 'I'-psalms is not so important as has been supposed. It is not a part of the larger question as to the date of the psalms, for the representation of a body of men as a single being is primitive; 'I'-psalms might, if the tone of thought and the social background permitted, be pre-exilic. Nor does it greatly affect the exegesis of the psalms, except indeed when by means of forced interpretations Duhn and B. Jacob endow the speakers of the psalms with a vigorous and almost self-assertive personality. Between those who contend that the speaker of a psalm (or of a part of a psalm) is a representative or typical pious Israelite, and those who regard the speaker as the community itself personified, there is, exegetically, but a slight difference. And yet this difference is not to be wholly disregarded. A close study of the psalms, especially in

<sup>1</sup> See especially Smend, *ZATW*, viii. 49 ff. [1888]. This able critic, however, has since 1888 somewhat modified his original position, and in his *Lehrbuch der AT Rel.-Gesch.*,<sup>(2)</sup> p. 361, says that he is in essential agreement with Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 261 ff. Driver, too, has made progress in this direction since the first edition of his Introduction (see ed. 6, on the Psalms). For a full consideration of the subject, see also Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures on the Psalter*, Lecture vi. (with the notes); Beer, *Individual- und Gemeinde-Psalmen* (1894); Coblentz, *Ueb. das betende Ich in den Psalmen* (1897); H. Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde u. die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter* (1897); D. Leimdörfer, *Das Psalter-ego in den Ich-Psalmen* (1898); Thaddäus Engert, *Der betende Gerechte der Psalmen* (1902). Cp. also Schuurmans Stekhoven, *ZATW*, ix. 131 ff. [1889]; Budde, *Theol. Lit.-ztg.*, May 14. 1892, col. 254; J. Robertson, *Croall Lectures on the Psalms*; and Kautzsch, *Die Poesie u. die poet. Bücher des A. T.* (1902), pp. 49-51.

## INTRODUCTION.

connexion with a keen textual criticism, will probably show the greater naturalness (from the point of view of *Völkerpsychologie*) of the latter way of accounting for the phenomena. Occasionally, of course, e.g. in xxxiv. 11. [12], xlv. 2 [1], lxxviii. 1 f., cvi. 4 f., there is no possible doubt that it is the poet himself who speaks; but these passages are widely different from those about which somewhat too lively a dispute has arisen among critics of the Psalter. The evidence of the heading of Ps. cii. cannot rightly be brought against the view here recommended; the 'afflicted one' (עֲנִי) there spoken of is manifestly the pious community (cp. עֲנִי, lxi. 3, lxxvii. 4).

The chief names on the other side<sup>1</sup> are those of Nöldeke, B. Jacob, and Duhm. According to Nöldeke (*ZATW*, xx. [1900], 2 f.), the 'I'-psalms refer as a rule to the poet himself; this is based on the observation that in the songs in the Hebrew text of Eccus. li. 2-12 and 13-29 it must be Ben Sira who speaks.<sup>2</sup> Very different is the view of B. Jacob (*ZATW*, xvii. [1897], 544 ff.), who maintains that psalms were composed for the use of individuals who had some sacrificial rite to perform in the temple, as a means of deliverance from sickness, or as a thank-offering for recovery, and goes so far as to define the Psalter (in opposition to Olshausen and many others) as 'ein Gemeindeopfergesangbuch—das hat uns סלה gelehrt,—ein Privat(opfer)gebetbuch—das sollte להזכיר zeigen.' To these we may add Duhm, who, as a commentator, represents the same tendency, and carries the individualizing interpretation of the speakers of the psalms to an extreme. The objections to this view will appear to any student of Duhm's always clear and consistent, but too often strained, exegesis.

§ 26. The poetical form of the Psalms cannot here be treated at length. To enter into the intricacies of the subject a special monograph would be required. Grimme's *Psalmenprobleme* (1902) breaks much fresh ground, but his results appear to me very

<sup>1</sup> I do not mention König (*Eint.*, p. 400), because he admits the representative character of most of the individuals who are the supposed speakers in the psalms. In Ps. xxiii., however, the speaker, he thinks, is not the collective community (Sined), but a fugitive, who is cut off from visits to the temple, like David, according to 1 Sam. xxvi. 19. (But surely the speaker in this and parallel psalms is the company of faithful Israelites and diligent frequenters of the temple, who formed the *kernel* of the post-exilic Judæan community).

<sup>2</sup> This observation of Nöldeke, however, is hardly self-evident so far as li. 2-12 is concerned.

difficult to accept. Still he deserves much credit for his willingness to adopt even radical remedies, where he finds a sufficient reason for them. Prof. Briggs has remarked<sup>1</sup> that the study of the measurement of the line, and the strophical arrangement of the psalms, combined with the study of their grouping, throws fresh light on the Psalter. But this is only true on condition that we emancipate ourselves completely from conventional opinions as regards the general accuracy of the Massoretic text. I must confess that Duhm's work, 'dictatorial' in tone as it may be, and often as I must differ from its results, has been more suggestive to me, as regards the poetical form of the Psalms, than any other which has appeared since Bickell's *Carmina Vet. Test. metricæ*,<sup>2</sup> and to his interesting, though too short, article 'Poetical Literature' in the *Enc. Biblica* I would refer the student. By far the larger number of psalms are (to borrow a term from Prof. Briggs) trimeters. So also thinks Duhm. There are, however, also tetrameters, pentameters, and hexameters. As a rule, the metre of a psalm is consistently carried out. When a psalm falls into two distinct parts which differ in metre, this implies, not that the psalmist for some reason changed his metre, but that a redactor joined together two psalms or fragments of psalms. It may also happen that a brief liturgical addition has been made in a different metre. Once or twice only (*e.g.* Ps. cxl.) have I met with a psalm, in which, through the author's or rather the compiler's carelessness, the metre varies, and once (Preface to Ps. i., *i.e.* *iii.* 1-3) with a passage which is rather to be called rhythmical than metrical.<sup>3</sup>

On the question whether true strophic divisions are still traceable in the Psalms I confess myself unable to say much, evidence being deficient. That 'Selah' has anything to do with strophes (as Grimme and others think), has been denied already (see p. xli.). Refrains, however, are of course an infallible criterion of strophes. Every one therefore admits strophes in xlii.-xliii., xlvi., xlix. ; with hardly less certainty we may point

<sup>1</sup> *Presbyterian Review*, Oct. 1888, p. 661.

<sup>2</sup> Sievers' *Metrische Studien* appeared too late to influence me considerably. Vol. i. abounds in observations of facts, and acute, even if not always adequate, explanations. He has thought it necessary to take the textual tradition as his basis, which often makes a successful restoration of the metrical arrangement impossible.

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Paul Haupt, however, by clever manipulation, reduces even this troublesome passage to metrical consistency (*AJSL*, 1903, pp. 129-142).

to strophes in Ps. cvii. Various forms of alphabetic structure appear in seven psalms (ix.-x., xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxi., cxix., cxlv.). The supposed acrostic in Ps. cx. is highly precarious.

§ 27. I now pass on to the treatment of the text in this edition. I have independently come to the same conclusion as Bernhard Duhm, who, to emphasize the need of a more sceptical attitude towards tradition, points out<sup>1</sup> that 'in many passages, by which the modern critic passes unsuspectingly, the tenor may be due rather to the old Jewish redactors than to the author himself.' I have not, however, given the reins to fancy; such a course was only permissible in the first half of the last century. In the first stage of inquiry I have been accustomed to note with care the occurrence of the vertical stroke called *Paseḳ* and *Legarmeh*, and I have often found the suspicion awakened by *Paseḳ* confirmed by other phenomena of the text. This is but the further development of a hint given by J. Olshausen,<sup>2</sup> who thinks that *Paseḳ* sometimes indicates the presence of glosses and interpolations (he refers to Ps. ix. 7; xvii. 4; xviii. 7; xxxi. 12). A similar view was expressed by von Ortenberg in an article in Stade's *Zeitschrift* (vii. 301 ff. [1887]). This scholar considers the *Paseḳ*s and *Legarmeh*s to be indications of the thorough redaction bestowed on the Hebrew text. In all probability the vertical stroke was intended — somewhat in the manner of Origen's obelos — to mark the insertions made in the text by an early editor. Later on, it was used by the scribe to indicate interpolations (such as the name of God, or synonymous words, or prophetic formulæ, or notices on the name of the author, or on the origin of the book). The article was good pioneering work, and is not refuted by that learned textual scholar Dr. Wickes (*ZATW*, viii. 149 [1888]), who appears to have no comprehension of any but a strictly conservative point of view. Grimme's section on *Paseḳ*-*Legarmeh*<sup>3</sup> is much wider in its range than the article of von Ortenberg. I have not been able, however, to use it, owing to the advanced state of my own work when it appeared, and will only add that, while not denying that *Paseḳ* may sometimes have other more special references, I have found it true in my own experience that it often gives warning of a corrupt and manipulated passage in the traditional text.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Das Buch Hiob übersetzt*, Preface, p. vi.    <sup>2</sup> *Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, p. 86 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Psalmenprobleme*, pp. 147-165.

<sup>4</sup> This appears to be also Duhm's view.

In the next stage I have used the versions, seeking suggestions from them as to passages which need further examination. After this I have used, in addition to the older and now much improved methods, a gradually accumulated experience of the habits of the scribes and editors in dealing with indistinctly written or, to them, incomprehensible passages, and of recurring types of corruption, as a means of correcting the text. I have also welcomed the control derived from the new N. Arabian theory which has now such a large amount of support from textual criticism elsewhere—having solved many problems which were otherwise insoluble—that one cannot refuse to apply it to the Psalms. Lastly, I have, to the best of my ability, considered the claims of metre, first determining the metre by the help of the sound passages of a psalm, and then completing the restoration of the unsound passages by accommodating the new reading to the metre. That the total result is often open to revision, no one can know so well as myself. But I cherish the conviction that here as well as elsewhere I have discovered not a few textual facts, and that even my errors will very often be found to be on the line of truth, and that if others adopt my expanded method, there will be many more such confirmations of my results as those reported in my note on Ps. ii. 11 (vol. i., p. 8). There is at any rate nothing for me to apologize for. The need of a more searching criticism of the text of the Psalter was great, and a step in advance could only be taken by one who was not afraid of revising his printed opinions, and of studying the phenomena of the text of the Old Testament on a large scale.<sup>1</sup> Once more, let me repeat that what I have called (see p. viii.) the ‘newer Psalter’ is not, in my judgment, superseded by the discovery of the older one. Stimulus to the higher life can still be derived from it, and it has, and must ever have, the attraction of its priceless associations. Sometimes, however, even religiously, the older Psalter is finer, and in any case a lover of the Bible is bound, if he can, to find out how it came into existence. And it is surely permissible to prophesy that religion and history will yet ‘kiss one another,’ as predestined friends and allies.

ROCHESTER,

*September 30, 1903.*

<sup>1</sup> See an examination of the text of the more obscure parts of the Old Testament by the present writer, now in course of publication by Messrs. A. & C. Black, London. The Prophets, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings are out.



## CONCLUDING NOTICE.

IN the preceding Introduction some passages have been taken, with or without modification, from the article 'Psalms, Book of' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. It may be within the knowledge of some readers that in this and several other articles in that work a somewhat new plan was adopted—viz. to begin with a statement of the position of criticism fifteen or twenty years ago, and then to give some account of the new problems and correspondingly new solutions which have emerged since then, or are now coming into view. No better sketch of the earlier criticism and its provisional results could, as it appeared, be had than the article 'Psalms,' by the late Prof. Robertson Smith, in *Enc. Brit.*<sup>(1)</sup> This was printed by the author in 1886, and virtually re-indorsed by him in *OTJC*<sup>(2)</sup> (1892). This keen scholar was, however, not unaware that the criticism there presented would ultimately need much revision, expansion, and (if new facts came to light) correction. Friendship can never justify a lover of truth in holding back his best knowledge. Hence in the second part of the article 'Psalms' in the *Enc. Bib.* much was given in advance from the present work, as the MS. then stood. But what investigator would tie himself to any printed or written page? When a new and remunerative method is applied—virtually for the first time, it is inevitable that in the course of completing a MS. for press imperfect results should be corrected, and previously unobserved points should have to be utilized. Hence the necessity for the pages of *Corrigenda and Addenda* (errata are included) which the reader will kindly not overlook (see pp. lxxiv.—lxxx.); he is requested to make reference to those pages at the places to which the Corrigenda and Addenda belong, and may be reminded that the process of printing such a work is a slow one. Another point may also be referred to. It seemed needless to repeat here the long list of books and articles on the Psalms given in *Enc. Biblica*, cols. 3965-3967. A reference, however, is called for to a forthcoming work by Gunkel (to whom we are already indebted for critical work on some passages of the psalms in his *Schöpfung und Chaos*), consisting of a series of translations and explanations of psalms originally published in German periodicals.

Also to articles by J. C. Matthes, 'Die Psalmen und der Tempeldienst,' *ZATW*, xxxii. 65-82 (the psalms mostly the utterance of the community, and the Psalter a temple-hymnbook; contrast Duhm, *Psalmen*, p. xxiv.), and by Paul Haupt, 'The Poetic Form of Psalm i.' (see p. lxvii., note<sup>3</sup>), and to A. Rahlfs, *Die Berliner Handschrift des sahidischen Psalters* (Transactions of the Göttingen 'Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften,' philology and history, new series, vol. iv., no. 4).

Grimme's *Psalmenprobleme; Untersuchungen über Metrik, Strophik und Peseq des Psalmenbuches*, 1902 (the work of, probably, our leading metrician), has already received due recognition, and Wellhausen's supplement to his critical notes on the text of the Psalms in *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi. (1899), 163-187, though already mentioned in *Enc. Bib.*, col. 3967, may here again be specially referred to. This able work, though it proves the care with which the older methods have been applied by the author to many passages, also exemplifies the urgent need for the application of new and more potent methods to those deeper problems which even Wellhausen by the means which he adopted could not solve. A similar remark applies, I fear I must add, to many of the text-critical conjectures of that giant-scholar, Lagarde. The criticisms in the Prologue to my *Critica Biblica* (see especially p. 4) may here be compared.

Lastly, I have to mention the works of two little-known English scholars. One is a translation of the Psalms from a corrected text by Street, an Anglican Clergyman, in 1790 (2 vols.); the other is an unpublished collection of text-critical notes on the Psalms by Mr. N. Herz, a Christian-Jewish scholar, who kindly placed his work at my full disposal, and from whom I have now and then been able to borrow, and oftener to record, interesting emendations. I need not add that Mr. Herz is in no way responsible for anything beyond the text-critical suggestions expressly assigned to him here.

*September 30, 1903.*

## ABBREVIATIONS.

IN general, the abbreviations are those which are used in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and therefore do not differ greatly from those to which the readers of such works are accustomed. Some of them, however, may be given here (see *Enc. Bib.*, vol. iv., pp ix.-xxviii.).

M=Massoretic Text ; G = the Septuagint ; 'A = Aquila ; Σ = Symmachus ; Θ = Theodotion ; S = Syriac (Peshitta) ; J = Jerome ; T = Targum ; E' and S' = the fifth and sixth Greek versions in Origen's Hexapla.

Bä.=Bäthgen ; Bi.=Bickell ; Che.<sup>(1)</sup>=Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, 1888 ; Dr., Driv.=Driver ; Du.=Duhm ; Dys.=Dyserinck ; Gr.=Grätz ; Kau.=Kautzsch ; Kirkp.=Kirkpatrick ; K̄i.=K̄imhi ; Kr., Krochm.=Abraham Krochmal ; Kön.=König ; Lag.=Lagarde ; Wellh.=Wellhausen ; Wi.=Winckler.

*AJSL* = American Journal of Semitic Languages.

*Ass. HWB* = Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*. *BDB* = Hebrew and English Lexicon, by F. Brown, with the co-operation of S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

*Crit. Bib.* = *Critica Biblica*, Parts i.-iv., by T. K. Cheyne (A. & C. Black, 1903).

*Exp. T.* = Expository Times. *Ges.-Bu.* = Gesenius' *Handwörterbuch*, edited by Buhl (1899). *JBL* = Journal of Biblical Literature (Boston, Mass. ; in England, J. Parker and Co.). *JQR* = Jewish Quarterly Review. *JRL* = Jewish Religious Life after the Exile, by T. K. Cheyne (1898).

*Indiv. u. Gem. Ps.* = *Individual- und Gemeinde-Psalmen*, by G. Beer (1894).

*J. of Theol. St.* = Journal of Theological Studies.

*J. Prot. Th.* = *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*.

*OP* = The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter, by T. K. Cheyne (1891).

*OTJC.*=The Old Test. in the Jewish Church, by W. Robertson Smith ; second ed., 1892.

*SBOT*=The Sacred Books of the Old Testament, by various scholars, edited by Paul Haupt (Psalms, Hebrew, 1895 ; English, 1898).

*Siegfr.-Sta.* = *Hebräisches Wörterbuch*, by C. Siegfried and B. Stade (1893).

*Stellung*=*Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*, by A. Bertholet (1896).

*Styl.*=*Stylistik*, by F. E. König (1902).

*Th. T., Theol. Tijdschr.*=*Theologisch Tijdschrift* (Leyden).

*WF*=translation of Psalms by Wellhausen-Furness in *SBOT*.

*ZATW*=*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (edited by Stade).

Where 'Smend' occurs with page-reference, see Smend's article, 'Ueber das Ich der Psalmen,' *ZATW*, viii. 49-147 [1888]; where 'Coblenz,' see Coblenz, *Über das betende Ich in den Psalmen* (1897); where 'Roy,' see Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde und die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter* (1897).

Words inclosed in [ ] represent Hebrew words inserted for metrical reasons, without authority from the traditional Hebrew text (M & G); those inclosed in ++ have been added merely to clear up the English sense.

## CORRIGENDA AND ADDENDA.

Owing to the length of time occupied by the printing, a number of corrections and additions have become 'desirable (see p. lxx.).

### I. RELATIVE TO TITLES OF PSALMS AND TO SUBSCRIPTION OF BOOK II.

- (1) Pss. iv.-vi., and all the **למנצח** psalms. For 'Deposited' read 'Of Jerahmeel-asshur'; in Ps. xxii. read the same words for 'Of Ethan the Zarhite.' or rather omit them (the Hebrew words were a correction of '**למנ**'); and in xxxii., xlii., xlv. &c. (the **משכיל** psalms) for 'Deposited' read 'Of Cusham.'
- (2) iii.-vi., and all the **מומר** psalms. For 'Marked' read '[Of Jerahmeel.'
- (3) iv., vi., viii., xii., lx., lxix. For 'Ethanites' read 'Ishmaelites.'
- (4) v., ix., xlv., xlix., liii. For 'Salmah' (or 'Salmath') read 'the Ishmaelites.'
- (5) xvi., lvi.-lx. (the **מכתם** psalms). For 'a supplication' read '[Maacathites].'
- (6) xviii., xxxvi. After 'Of Jerahmeel-asshur' ('Deposited') read 'Of Arāb-jerahmeel'; and in Ps. xviii. after 'Of Arāb-ethan' insert 'Of Jerahmeel-asshur' (= M's **אשר ליהוה**, transposing; **דבר** represents a dittographed **דברי**).
- (7) xxii. For 'Deposited. Of Ethan the Zarhite' read 'Of Jerahmeel-asshur.'
- (8) xxx. For 'Supplication of Sabbath' read 'Supplication. [Of the Ishmaelites.] **חנכת** comes from **תחנך**. **הבית** corresponds to **שבת** in xcii. 1, and to **בת שבע** in li. 1. **ה** and **ש** confounded; cp. Ezek. xxxix. 2, **ששאתיד** miswritten for '**הש**.']
- (9) xxxviii., lvii., lviii., lix., lxx., lxxv. For 'Of Ethan the Ezrahite' read 'Of Ashhur.'
- (10) xlv. For 'Cushanites' read 'Ishmaelites.'
- (11) li. For 'Sabbath' read 'Ishmaelites.'

- (12) xlvi. 1, &c. (שיר מזמור). For 'Marked' read '[Of] Asshur-jerahmeel'; and in lxviii. 1, &c. (מזמור שיר) for 'Marked' read '[Of] Jerahmeel-asshur.'
- (13) lxx. 1. For 'Marked: of 'Arab-ethan' read '[Of] Jerahmeel-asshur. Of 'Arab-ethan.'
- (14) lxxv. 1. For 'Marked. Of Asaph. Marked' read '[Of] Jerahmeel-asshur. Of Asaph.'
- (15) cxx. 1, &c. For 'Marked' read '[Of] Asshur.'
- (16) lx. Before 'of 'Arab-ethan' insert 'a supplication,' and after it 'of Jerahmeel.'
- (17) lxxii. V. 20 should run thus: 'Finished are the praise-songs of  
 • 'Arab-ethan [the benê Ishmael]. The words in [ ] represent a variant.

## II. RELATIVE TO PSALMS AND NOTES ON PSALMS.

- P. 3. Crit. note on P's. i., l. 4. Duhm (1899) and P. Haupt (1903) also adopt בִּירְאֵת. See Haupt. 'The Poetic Form of the First Psalm,' *AJSL*, xix. 129-142.
- P. 3. P's. ii., introd., l. 3. Omit 'Smend.' See General Introd., pp. xxxii. ff. (on royal psalms).
- P. 5. P's. ii., l. 20. For 'Geshur' read 'Ishmael,' and alter crit. note, p. 8. ברזל sometimes = יִשְׁמַעֵאל, or more strictly ז'. See *Crit. Bib.* on 1 S. xvii. 7, Judg. iv. 3 and cp.
- P. 7, l. 3. Read certainly מְקַדְשֵׁיהֶם | וְנִשְׁחִיתָה אֲרָמְנוֹתֵיהֶם.  
 Cp. on lxxiv. 9. Or, if we will, we may recognize the suffix מו (exilic or post-exilic; Diehl).
- P. 8. On Ps. ii., ll. 22 f. Add 'ארץ' seems to be redactional.' - On Ps. ii., l. 25. Sievers (*Metr. Stud.*, 582) sees at least that נ' בר is unintelligible. Beer (*Th. Lit.-stg.*, May 23, 1903, col. 323) goes further, but is unaware that the priority of the best conjecture is mine. Grimme's נִשְׁקִי נָבֶר, 'kiss the master,' is both improbable and superficial. Paul Haupt (*Univ. Circular*, Baltimore, June 1903, p. 90b; cp. *AJSL*, xix. 134) thinks that בר in M = בר, 'field, land, ground,' Job xxxix. 4, and in Talm. (cp. Ar. *barr*, 'land'), and Ember (*ibid.*) restores בר נִשְׁקִי בר ברעדה, overlooking a plain dittography. Haupt (*AJSL*, xix. 130) is for a Maccabæan origin of the psalm (coronation of Aristobulus, 105-104 B.C.).
- Pp. 10, 11. Translate Ps. iii., l. 11, thus: 'In Jerahmeel to thee I cry.' For קולי read בִּירְחֵמָאֵל (see on lxxvii. 2), and for read אֵלֶיךָ; יהוה may = ירח' (i.e. it is a correction of P. 11. For סל read

- P. 20, foot (L. 12). For 'Supplement' read 'Jerahmeel,' as footnote.  
סלה for חמל (from 'ירח'), as often. It is a gloss on ערבי, L. 9.
- P. 22. On\*Ps. vii.<sup>(1)</sup>, L. 5. Grimme (*Psalm.-prob.*) reads גאות for זאת.  
Palæographically possible, but inadequate to parallelism.
- P. 25, L. 15. For 'heights' read 'height.'—Ps. viii., L. 1, read 'name<sup>2</sup>!'
- P. 29, note <sup>2</sup>, and p. 33, midway. Translate v. 21 thus: 'Destroy Jerahmeel, O Yahwè! | Let the nations know that they are but men.'  
For שירה read תשחית, and for מורה להם read ירחמאל.  
The סלה, as elsewhere, probably represents ירחמאל (a marg. correction).
- P. 43. On Ps. xiv. Does this psalm, and also lxxiv.<sup>(1)</sup>, refer to the destruction of the temple at the close of the regal period, or to some subsequent destruction or profanation? In the former case the writer throws himself back in imagination to a long-past period.—In ll. 2, 3 of introd., for 'It differs, however,' read 'As in Pss. xi., xii., the objects,' &c.
- P. 44, ll. 9, 10 should be marked as (verses) 5, 6.
- P. 44, L. 8. For 'Kenn,' read 'Kenn.' (i.e. Kennicott).
- P. 45. Omit short note on L. 10.
- P. 51. Ps. xvi., L. 17. For 'then' read 'thou.'
- P. 54. Note on 5, end. Add, 'For עצבותם read צבאות, "armies (of)."'
- Pp. 64, 70. Ps. xviii. The four lines forming vv. 5, 6 must be considered with cxvi. 3. They have probably grown out of two, which should run thus—

The question as to a reference to the Babylonian Waters of Death now becomes superfluous. See however Zimmern, *KAT*<sup>(3)</sup>, pp. 576, 642. נחלי קליעל יבעתוני and חבלי שאול סבבוני are variants to v. 5a. But מות comes from 'ירח', and שאול from 'שמו' (as in Isa. xxviii. 15, 18). Consequently one couplet has been lost.

- P. 68. Note on ll. 25 f. (end). See Zimmern's explanation from Babylonian sources, in *KAT*<sup>(3)</sup>, p. 631.
- P. 69. First crit. note. ויאמר (v. 2) may = ירחמאל (cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 2 S. i. 18a), a marg. gloss on ישמעאל (underlying שאול).
- P. 85, L. 6. Add, 'סלה, as often, comes from אלהים.'
- P. 92, L. 14 from top. P. Haupt defends the reading כארו (*Univ. Circular*, June, 1903); Grimme (*Ps.-prob.*) adheres to כארי, 'zermalmen.'
- P. 95, L. 6, and p. 96, to open first crit. note. For 'thy glory' read 'thy works.' משך should be מעשך (cp. on cxxviii. 2).

- P. 97, l. 8 from foot. Read **הַשִּׁיעֲנִי**, and omit reference to cii. 19.
- P. 98, l. 7. For 'probably' read 'possibly.'
- P. 103. Ps. xxiv.<sup>(2)</sup>, l. 17. For 'the God' read '[the God].'<sup>1</sup>—P. 104, foot. Add, 'In l. 17 insert **אלהי**. The closing **סלה** is an imitation of *7. 6*; G omits.'
- P. 105, l. 7. For 'want' read 'wont.'—P's. xxv., l. 2. For 'my soul' read 'me' (cp. crit. n.).
- P. 112, l. 8 from foot. For 'xxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>' read 'xxvii.<sup>(2)</sup>'
- P. 115. Ps. xxvii.<sup>(2)</sup>, l. 10. For 'the Ishmaelites' read 'Arabia and Cush.'<sup>2</sup>
- P. 118, ll. 3, 8. Read 'M **קמרי**.' and (l. 8) **עַרְב וְכוּשׁ**. Cp. crit. note on Ps. xxxv., l. 13.
- P. 121. Ps. xxviii., last crit. note. Add, 'cxxxii. 10.'
- P. 134. Ps. xxxii.<sup>(1)</sup>, l. 12. For '[all] those,' &c., read 'those of Ishmael,' and omit 'Supplement [Selah].'<sup>2</sup>—In p. 136, l. 4 of note on ll. 11 f., read **מישמעאלים**. Cp. the corrupt **יסובברו** in lv. 11. For 'the Selah,' &c., read '**סלה** is a corruption of **ירחמאל** (gloss).'
- P. 140. Crit. notes, l. 1. For 2 read 4.
- P. 144. Ps. xxxv., introd., l. 16. For 'Jer. 4. 34' read 'Jer. l. 34.'
- P. 156, l. 5. With regard to **רחבית** for **בהמה**, cp. the case of Jon. iv. 7, where (see *Crit. Bib.*) **בהמה רבה** represents **רחבות** (**רבה** = **ר[ח]בת**), a correction of **בהמה** | **רחבה**).
- P. 159. Ps. xxxvii., l. 78. Read rather, 'And prospering like the cedar of Jerahmeel.'
- P. 164. On ll. 77 f. (beginning), for **נעלה** read **מעלה**.—**ומתערה**: rather **ומצליח**. The difficult **כאזרח רענן** can now be explained. 'ר' comes from **ירחמאל** (intermediate reading, **רחמאן**); see *Crit. Bib.* on 'ר' **עין** r', Dt. xii. 2. **אזרח** represents **אָרָז**, with a **ח** appended from **ירחמאן** = 'ירח'.
- P. 179. Ps. xl.<sup>(2)</sup> For 'Mišrites' read 'Asshurites,' and, five lines lower, for **מצור** read **אשור**; cp. on Ps. lxix.<sup>(1)</sup>, l. 9.
- P. 180 (top). The following lines, composing Ps. xl.<sup>(2)</sup>, have accidentally been omitted:—

1 Be pleased, O Yahwè! to rescue me, | hasten to my help! 14  
 Let them turn back with shame together | that seek after 15  
 my soul.<sup>1</sup>  
 Let them retreat with confusion | that delight in my harm,  
 Let them be appalled for their +malicious+ joy | that say,  
 Aha, aha! 16  
 Let them rejoice and be glad because of thee— | all that  
 seek thee, 17

<sup>1</sup> To take it away. (Unmetrical interpolation.)



Let them say continually, Great is Yahwè, | who desire thy deliverance.

And I am one in misery and in need ; | O Yahwè ! hasten to me.

Thou art my helper and my deliverer ; | O my God ! tarry not.

18

P. 188, l. 6 from foot. Read 'is פניי.'

P. 191. On l. 28. Theod. C. Foote (*JBL*, 1902, part i.) follows Lagarde.

P. 193. Ps. xlv.<sup>(2)</sup>, introd., l. 1. For 'maytyr' read 'martyr.'

P. 195, l. 1. Read, 'Thou givest up thy flock.' Cp. crit. note.

P. 198, foot. (Add.) For Paul Haupt's view of Ps. xlv. see *AJS*, xix. 135 f. It 'consists of ten couplets with three beats in each hemistich.' The end of the title in M, משכיל שיר ידידת, with the alteration of מ into א, becomes hemistich 1, 'A love-song with skill I indite.' בנות מלכים and ביק in v. 10 are amplificative plurals.—Prefix <sup>(1)</sup> to footnote ('Gunkel,' &c.).

P. 198. (Add this to par. 3.) If *bath Miṣraim* is correct (and probably it is), it is an evidence of the very late date of the psalm. For the earlier reading of 1 K. iii. 1, ix. 16 referred to the king of Miṣrim (in N. Arabia) as the father-in-law of Solomon. See *Crit. Bib.* on 1 Kings.

P. 199, l. 2. For 'Reuben' read 'Ruben.'

P. 203, l. 10. For ασεδ read ασεδ. The suggestion is that G's ασεδ was originally ασεδ, i.e. הסד, a corruption of חשר = אֶשְׁחָר.

P. 210. On Ps. xlvii., l. 7. Add, 'הללו סלה' probably comes from הללו; cp. on lxxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, l. 33.'

P. 237. On lii., l. 5 f. Insert, 'For רע מטוב read מרמות ו, "tricks and." Also for סלה read

P. 239. On liv., l. 8. Add, 'סלה' has come from a repeated

P. 245. On ll. 21-24. Or הוות might come from חמת = מעבת.

P. 246. On ll. 41 f. Before יענה insert הוא (represented only by ו). ג, as usual, is a fragment of an ethnic. Grimme, however, reads ג, 'rock,' i.e. God.

P. 257. On l. 32. For 'my day of distress' read 'the day of Ishmael' ('ביום ישמ'). See crit. n. on cii.<sup>(1)</sup>, l. 4.

Pp. 260 f. Ps. lx., crit. note on Title (end). Add, 'In v. 2b, in accordance with numerous parallels, שנים עשר אלף has come from ישמן אשר מאל = ירחמאל, אשחור, ישמעאל, glosses on ארם. See on 2 S. viii. 13.' In Title insert '[of] the Maacathites'

- P. 263, Ps. lxi.<sup>(1)</sup>, l. 2. At right hand insert 3.
- P. 274. Ps. lxy., ll. 1 f. 'God in Zion' can hardly mean 'God who art in Zion' (Kön., *Styl.*, 18). There is no full parallel.—*LL*. 11 f. For 'Jerahmeelites' read 'Ashhurites,' and for 'Rehoboth' read probably 'Jerahmeel.'
- P. 277. On *LL*. 11 f. For 'ירח' read 'אשחורים' (cp. on 'מקצותם', Judg. xviii. 2), and for 'בקר' read 'ירחמאל' (see on cxxx. 6).
- P. 283. Ps. lxvi.<sup>(2)</sup>, ll. 11 f. König's treatment of the difficulties (*ZATW*, xviii., 1898, pp. 247–251) fails to satisfy me that the text is right.
- P. 284. Ps. lxvii., ll. 3, 10. Add, 'סלה, as often, comes from אלהים.'
- Pp. 286, 292 f. On Ps. lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup>, ll. 36 f., and lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, l. 6. Restore 'Bashan'  
 • (a N. Arabian district, see *Crit. Bib.* on Num. xxi. 33).—On p. 292, l. 9 from foot, omit 'read הר הנגב,' &c., and on p. 293, l. 5, for כושן read ישמעאל. The final נ in שנאן is dittographic. שנא, as in cxxvii. 2, and like אנוש in lvi. 2, &c., represents ישמעאל. Consequently on p. 286, Ps. lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup>, l. 42, read 'Ishmael' instead of 'Cushan.'—Lastly, Ps. lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, l. 5, 'Seir' should be 'Asshur' (the N. Arabian Asshur); see crit. note.
- P. 297. Ps. lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, ll. 26 ff., end. For 'be made' read 'he made.'
- P. 299. Ps. lxi.<sup>(1)</sup>, l. 38. Read, 'From Ishmael deliver me speedily' (מישמעאל בְּהֵרָה הַשִּׁיעֵנִי). Cp. crit. n. on cii.<sup>(1)</sup>, ll. 4, 6.
- P. 310. Ps. lxxii., introd. P. Haupt (*Univ. Circ.*, June 1903, p. 54*a*) may be mentioned with Hitzig, Reuss, &c.
- P. 316. After notes on Ps. lxxii., insert 'BOOK III.'

## (VOL. II.)

- Pp. 29–31. Ps. lxxx., l. 2. Read, 'O Shepherd of Israel! give deliverance.'—As footnote to 'Yahwè,' ll. 9, 39, insert 'Elohim.'—In crit. note on ll. 1 f. (p. 31), for האירה read השיעה, and for read נגהך.—On ll. 17 ff. (p. 30), refer to note on civ. 15.
- P. 39, note 1. Add, 'We can then account for סלה, which so very often comes either from אלהים or from
- P. 41. Ps. lxxxiii., l. 16. Add note on 'Peleth,' 'Jerahmeel.'—P. 44, note on l. 16. Add, 'סלה = ירחמאל, a gloss on Peleth.'
- Pp. 50, 52. Ps. lxxxv., introd., l. 5. For 'even' read 'been.'—Ps. lxxxv.<sup>(2)</sup>, introd., l. 2. For 'M T' read 'M.'
- P. 57. On Ps. lxxxvii., l. 3. Add, 'סלה is a dittographed  
 P. 58. On l. 7, end. Add, '[or rather סלה = אלהינו (see l. 9)].'
- P. 61. On l. 24. Add, 'סלה (not in G) =
- P. 63. Ps. lxxxix.<sup>(1)</sup>, introd., last line but one. For 'Gunbel' read 'Gunkel.'

- P. 66, l. 6. Insert, 'The סלה in v. 5 = either אלהים or ירחמאל.'
- P. 67. On lxxxix., ll. 13-16. On M's text cp. König, *Styl.*, p. 180.
- P. 88. On xcii., l. 17. Add, 'It is one objection to M that the horns of the wild ox (רְאִים) are somewhat short.'
- P. 109. Ps. cii.<sup>(1)</sup>, ll. 4, 6. Read, 'Guard me in the day of Ishmael'; 'In the day of Jerahmeel deliver me.' Cp. above, on Ps. lx. (title).
- P. 123. On civ., l. 35. For further parallels for the asshur-tree, see *Crit. Bib.* on Dt. xii. 2.
- P. 151, ll. 1, 3. For 'good' read 'food.'
- P. 157. Ps. cxvi., l. 3. For 'nets' read 'toils.'
- P. 189. Ps. cxxvi., introd., l. 2. Add, 'and its present abasement.'

# THE PSALMS.

## PSALM I.

SINCE only *ll.* 10-15 are metrical (trimeters), this psalm must be composite. The metrical portion comes from a psalm dealing with the contrasting lots of the righteous and the wicked, and probably consisting of two six-line stanzas, one of which had become illegible, and was replaced by a late editor to the best of his ability. The date of this prefixed portion is evident. It belongs to the period of the great moralistic movement (*Prov.*), and takes us into the chamber of the Bible-student (*cp. Eccles. xiv. 20*); *Josh. i. 8* (late) is strikingly parallel to *l. 5*. See on *ll.* 4-8. It will be noticed that this portion contains three moral class-names, one of which is not found elsewhere in the Psalter (see below); the original psalm seems only to have contained two ('righteous' and 'wicked'): also that the inserted portion refers to individuals, whereas the original psalm must have referred to the righteous and the wicked collectively. It would seem that, in shaping the inserted portion, the editor had in view the need of a preface to a large Psalter of the pre-Maccabæan Greek period, which included the *Ethanic Psalter*. *Ps. ii.* doubtless already occupied its present position at the head of the *Ethanic Psalms*, and the editor sought, by the catch-words **אֲשֵׁרִי**, **דָּרַךְ**, **דִּנְהָה**, and **אֲבָר**, to produce an external parallelism between the two prefaces, *Pss. i. and ii.* This, together with the circumstance that *Ps. ii.* has no title, led many of the ancients, both Jews and Christians, to regard *Pss. i. and ii.* as a single psalm (see *Acts xiii. 33*, *Lag., Tisch., Treg.*, and *cp. Berachoth, 9b*, and for an exhaustive collection of evidence *Lagarde, Ps. Gr. 16-18*). This is clearly a mistake. Nothing in *Ps. i.* corresponds to the vivid scene-painting in *Pss. ii. ll. 1-14*. We cannot even suppose (with *Hengst. and Hitz.*) that they are separate works by the same author.

As to phraseological affinities: The argument based on these is less important than that from ideas, to which nevertheless it supplies useful support. (1) A combination of grounds lead us to refer the Book of Proverbs with full confidence to the post-exilic period. If we are convinced of this, we shall be at once inclined to refer *Ps. i.*, especially the inserted portion, to that period, because of the ethical class-names used in this psalm; that there is also a marked coincidence of idea between *Prov.* and the original part of the psalm needs no showing. (2) The affinity of lines 1-4 to *xxvi. 3-5* and *cxii.* is also striking; now *Ps. xxvi.* is post-Jeremian, and *Ps. cxii.* a Hallelujah psalm. Observe too that *Pss. i. and cxii.* both begin with **אֲשֵׁרִי** and end with **תִּאֲבָר**; indeed, according to our critical corrections, the last line of both psalms is the same. (3) The parallelism between *ll. 6-8* and *Jer. xvii. 8* is less important, but must not be neglected. That *Jer. l.c.* is the earlier passage may be assumed (see *OP, 240*). Most accept it as *Jer.'s* work; if so, *Ps. i. ll. 6-16* is presumably exilic or post-exilic. But far more probably *Jer. xvii. 5-8* is a post-exilic insertion; observe its individualistic character and its superfluity. This seems to push down the date of even the earlier part of *Ps. i.* to a somewhat late period.

*Later Preface.*

- 1 Happy the man that walks not in the counsel of the wicked, 1  
 Nor places himself in the way of sinners,  
 Nor has a seat in the conclave of scoffers ;  
 And whose delight is in the fear of Yahwè, 2  
 And who muses on his law day and night !  
 He is 'like a tree planted by running streams, 3  
 Which brings forth fruit in due season ;  
 Its foliage does not fade,'  
 And whatever he undertakes he achieves.

*Fragment.*

- 10 Not so fare the wicked, not so ; 4  
 +They are+ like chaff which the wind drives away.  
 The wicked will not maintain themselves in the judgment, 5  
 Nor the sinners in the assembly of the righteous.  
 Yea, the course of the righteous Yahwè regards, 6  
 But the expectation of the wicked will perish.

1-3. **Happy**, *i.e.* richly rewarded for his goodness, is the man who keeps apart from the wicked and studies the Scriptures. The original description of the righteous man (which was presumably in trimeters) has been replaced by a later passage (cp. Josh. i. 8). *Wicked* is one of three titles of the party opposed to Ezra's policy of religious isolation. For רשעים and חטאים, see on ix. 18, xxv. 8. לצים 'scoffers' is not one of the psalmists' words (another reason for supposing vv. 1-2 to be a later insertion). לץ is synon. with עריץ, 'tyrant,' in Isa. xxix. 20 (late), and with זך, 'arrogant,' in the definition of לץ in Prov. xxi. 24. לץ in G is λοιμός; so in Prov. xxii. 10, xxix. 8, but in Prov. xx. 1 ἀκόλαστος (Σ λοιμός). See also 1 Macc. x. 61 (|| παράνομοι). It means one who by his practice shows contempt for the Jewish religion.

4-8. Apparently imitated from Jer. xvii. 5-8; cp. also Josh. i. 8 (opening words). The phrase 'muses day and night' (cp. cxix. 148) is very characteristic of the Greek period, when the study of the Scriptures was the chief bulwark of the Jews against heathenism.

So in the Avesta (*Vendidad*, xviii. 6) it is the nightly search for 'the holy Wisdom, which makes man . . . cheerful at the head of the *Kinvat* bridge, which makes the true *Āthravan*.' The *law* of Yahwè means all sacred writings. *Running streams*, פלגי מים, a late phrase (cxix. 136, Is. xxxii. 2, Prov. twice, Lam. and Job once each). פלג also in Ps. lxxv. 10, and (plur.) xlv. 5 (but see notes), Is. xxx. 25 (late). פלגות, Ju. v. 15 f., probably corrupt; Job xx. 17 (late), 'streams' || נחלי (see Budde). In Jer. xvii. 8 יובל takes the place of פלגי מים, and in Is. xxx. 25, פלגים is explained by יבלי מים. On the whole, artificial watercourses are probably meant. Though Ass. *palu* means a canal, there is no reminiscence of Babylonia here; Palestinian agriculture supplies the figure (cp. Eccles. ii. 5 f.; Ecclus. xxiv. 30; Is. lviii. 11). *Planted*, or transplanted, fruit-trees being spoken of. Aq. μεταπνευσμένον; so also xcii. 14 (see Field). שתל is rare in Heb.; Hos. ix. 13 should be removed from the list of passages (see Nowack). In Syriac translations from the Greek

*ṣ'thal* sometimes at least appears as the rendering of μεταφύτευω (Lagarde, *Spec.* 13). The school of R. Janai adopted this distinction between שתל and נטע, and interpreted Ps. i. 1 accordingly (*Aboda sara*, 19). On the other hand נטעים and שתילים are both rendered in G νεόφυτα; cp. also Is. v. 7, νεόφυτον = נטע.

9. **He achieves** (makes to prosper). The old Hebrew doctrine that prosperity attends the righteous is adopted. The psalmist, however, is aware that the reward may in some cases be delayed. Hence he refers next to a sifting process through which the community of Israel will have to pass.

10-12. The author of the original psalm masses all the wicked together, without giving details of their conduct. Other psalmists enable us to repair his omission (see *J. R. L.* 117 ff.). The figure of the *chaff* describes equally

well the worthless inner nature of the wicked and their fate. Threshing-floors were usually on eminences, to take advantage of every breath of wind (Is. xvii. 13). In Jer. xvii. 6 the corresponding figure is taken (perhaps) from the stunted juniper of the desert; see 'Heath,' *Enc. Bib.*

13 f. The wicked, who now scandalise the pious, shall, when a greater judgment-day comes round, be separated from the true Israel (see *OP*, 254, 374, 406). This the Psalmist infers from the fact of which he has experience that the wicked, as a rule, meet sooner or later with a just retribution.

15. **But the expectation . . .** According to the common reading, the psalmist forms the image of a track fading away in the desert (cp. Job vi. 18). This, however, would have been expressed more clearly. The true idea is that the wicked who expect 'never to be moved' (x. 6) will be grievously disappointed, whereas the interests of the righteous are safe in the hands of Yahwe.

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. S transposes בעצת and בדרך. Ol. changes בעצת (twice) into בעדת, which G confirms in v. 5.

4. M בתורת. Read probably ביראת; so La. formerly (*Ps. Gr.* 12), Nestle (*Marg.* 32), cp. S, Sirach vi. 37. When a tautology can be so easily corrected, let it be corrected. Cp. xix. 10a and lxxxvi. 11b, G.

10. Add לא כן, G, Ba., We., thus completing a trimeter. The עליכן which opens v. 5 has perhaps arisen out of a marginal לא כן.

11 f. Omit כי אם, an expansion of a dittographed כנן. G adds ἀνὰ προσώπου τῆς γῆς, but we need not go out of our way to make the line prosaic. Omit על-כן; the passage is explanatory of v. 10 f. עלכן seems to be a corruption either of עלפנ[ן] (cp. G's addition to v. 4) or of לאכן (see on l. 10). Note the warning Pasek.

14. M דרד, an unpleasing repetition, due, as so often, to a scribe's error. Read תקנת, which suits the verb better (ix. 19).

## PSALM II.

FOUR stanzas of trimeters. For the contents see exegetical notes. The psalm has been much misunderstood. There is no reference either to the cruel Alexander Jannæus (Hitzig, Duhm, Smend, Bertholet) or to any other Jewish king. As elsewhere, the person who speaks in the first person (v. 7) is the pious Jewish community, regarded as a living organism. It is only the words משיחו and מלכי which suggest a reference to a king, and these words are probably corrupt. It was to Israel as the representative of the idealized David that the promise of the lordship of an expanded Canaan was understood by the post-exilic writers to have been made. A Messianic reference, in the narrower sense of the phrase, is only to be assumed when something in the contents of a psalm

(e.g. xlv., lxxii., ci. ?) compels us to suppose that a person, and not the pious community personified, is intended. See 'Psalms,' *Enc. Bib.*, §§ 24, 29.

The psalmist places himself in imagination in the age of the fulfilment of the promise. The 'nations round about' think to annul the claims of Yahwè and his people by once more invading and laying waste his land and destroying his sanctuary. The idea of an attack on Israel's holy land by confederate neighbouring peoples was characteristic of post-exilic times (see Ezek. xxxviii., Joel iv. [iii.], Zech. xiv.); it is the leading motive, not only of Ps. ii., but also of Pss. xlv., xlvi., lxxvi. It is possible indeed that the names of these nations may have acquired a symbolic character (cp. Is. xxxiv.), but the primary idea was that of a combined attack on the land of Israel by the nations round about. The reference to Zarephath, Jerahmeel, &c., is to be explained by 2 K. xxiv. 2 (corrected text), where all the populations mentioned are to the S. or S.E. of Palestine (Cushites, Edomites, Mišrites, Amalekites, or Jerahmeelites), which probably joined the 'Babylonians' in the great invasion of Judah (see 'Obadiah, Book of,' *Enc. Bib.*). The many psalms expressing an intense hatred of these peoples are, as we shall see, partly imaginative commemorations of the invasion of Judah by Edomites and others, partly deeply felt complaints of the continued aggressiveness of these races, which were akin to Israel. See introd. to Pss. xlii.-xliii., lv., and cp. Ps. xviii., where (as here) the Jerahmeelites, &c. may perhaps be viewed symbolically. Among phraseological parallels notice especially those suggested on lines 8-14. For other studies of Ps. ii. see Beer, *Indiv. Psalmen*, 1-3; Cheyne, *OP*, 238-241; *Christ. Use of Psalms*, 37-52.

P's. i. and ii. together (note the אֲשֶׁר in i. 1 and ii. 12) form a preface to a large Psalter (p. 1). The circumstance that P's. ii. (like Ps. i.) has no title creates a presumption that the date is late. At the same time it is conceivable that the title may have been removed, when the psalm acquired its present position; the parallel 83rd psalm is the last of the psalms of 'Asaph.' If the idea of a world-empire were certainly expressed in Ps. ii. we might be tempted to bring the psalm down to the time of Alexander, whose conquests would probably stimulate the growth of that idea. But we cannot be sure of this. At any rate the psalm was in existence when the 17th of the Psalms of Solomon (see v. 24) was written; Ps. ii. 9 is there applied in a strictly Messianic sense. The text of Ps. ii. therefore, had already become corrupted and editorially manipulated. The Talmud (*Berachoth*, 7b) makes Ps. ii. refer to the wars of Gog and Magog. Both these names, as it happens, are probably corruptions of fragments of 'Jerahmeel' (also distorted into 'Hamon-gog' and 'Ir-hamonah,' Ezek. xxxix. 15 f.!).

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  | Why do the nations conspire,             | 1  |
|    | The peoples meditate treason?            |    |
|    | The Jerahmeelites take up their station, | 2  |
|    | The Mišrites range themselves in order,  |    |
|    | Against Yahwè, against his loyal one;—   |    |
|    | 'Let us break down their sanctuaries,    | 3  |
|    | Let us destroy their palaces.'           |    |
|    | He that is throned in heaven laughs,     | 4  |
|    | The Lord of all+ mocks at them.          |    |
| 10 | At once he pursues them in his anger,    | 5  |
|    | And in his hot wrath affrights them—     |    |
|    | The Marshal of Israel—Yahwè.             | 7a |
|    | On his dwelling-place he has mercy,      | 6  |
|    | On Zion his holy mountain.               |    |

- He said to me, 'Thou art my son, 7b  
 I thy God have begotten thee. 7c  
 Ask +this+ of me, and I will grant thee 8  
 The nations as thine inheritance,  
 The land's utmost parts as thy possession.  
 20 Thou shalt subvert Zarephath and Geshur, 9  
 Thou shalt beat down Jerahmeel and Missur.'  
 O ye Jerahmeelites, show prudence ; 10  
 Take warning, ye men of Zarephath.  
 Become subject to Yahwè with fear, 11  
 Do homage to him with trembling,  
 Lest he be angry, and ye perish in a moment ; 12  
 For soon doth his wrath kindle ! 13  
 28 Happy all those that take refuge in him ! \*

1-7. A vivid description, parallel to lxxxiii. 4-6. The poet sees the 'nations round about' (Joel iii. [iv.] 11, cp. 4) plotting together to invade and lay waste Yahwè's land. He pronounces it to be treason, for the claim of Yahwè and his people to the sovereignty of Canaan in its fullest extent is well known to these nations. According to the ordinary view—viz. that the confederates are far distant nations—the psalmist falls short of perfect naturalness ; how could those nations have known or recognized Yahwè's claim ? But, since Israel's ancestors came from the N. Arabian border, the God of Israel would naturally claim that region for himself. *Their sanctuaries, their palaces*, cp. lv. 5, lxxiv. 9, lxxix. 1, lxxxiii. 13. *His loyal one*, i.e. Israel. See crit. note.

8-14. How Yahwè, in the poet's imagination, destroys the rebels. Parallel, lxxxiii. 16. The 'laugh' of Yahwè is a poetic expression for a peal of thunder. Cp. xviii. 8-20, where Yahwè is represented as appearing in a thunder-storm and rescuing his loyal servant Israel from his enemies. Later on in the same Psalm (?) it is Israel who crushes all who oppose him, but he does this in Yahwè's strength ; it is a miracle. How indeed, except by a miracle, could Jewish pietists cope with fierce Edomite warriors ? Yahwè, then, not Israel, is the true victor ; he has a tender regard (יחמל) for his threatened temple (l. 13 ; contrast Lam. ii. 6 f.). But the Israelites, as

the phrase 'Marshal (מחלק) of Israel' (as lxviii. 27b, ls. xxxiii. 22) shows, follow their divine Leader. *Laughs, mocks*. Parallel, lix. 9. *Pursues, affrights*. Cp. lxxxiii. 16 ; lix. lines 21, 23.

15-21. Before the revolt of the Jerahmeelites, Israel had received a divine oracle. As presented in this stanza it consists of three parts, 1. a declaration of Israel's divine sonship, 2. a promise of the land of Canaan in its utmost extent, and 3. a command to extirpate the bitter enemies of Israel on the N. Arabian border. *Thou art my son*. If this were addressed to the Messianic king we might suppose the divine sonship spoken of to mean membership in the college of heavenly, supernatural beings which is presided over by the Most High (cp. lxxxix. 6-8). True, there is no evidence that the historical Israelitish kings claimed to be members of that heavenly society, and even in lxxxix. 27 f. it is not probable that such a claim is implied for the Davidic king. Still the Assyrian and, yet more extravagantly, the Egyptian kings did advance the claim, and in the post-exilic age it might conceivably be advanced for the Messianic king in connexion with the view that the earthly kingdoms had celestial patrons (cp. *Ol'*, 130, 252 ; *Christ. Use of Psalms*, 43). Note, however, that in lxxii. 1 the Messianic king is called, not the son of God, but the 'king's son.' Of course with our revised text the temptation to adopt this



theory disappears. Sonship is to be taken in the same metaphorical sense as in Hos. xi. 1-4, Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 7, Mal. ii. 10, Dt. xxxii. 6 (cp. 15, 18). The words, *I thy God have begotten thee*, will then relate, not to any new dignity conferred on the person addressed, but to the divine purpose, which dates back to the earliest age in Israel's history, of making Israel the human agent in establishing the divine kingdom upon earth. No 'to-day' is needed, because God knows no yesterday. *The land's utmost parts*, אַפְסֵי־אֶרֶץ. Cp. lxxii. 8, Mic. v. 3 [4], Zech. ix. 10. In all these passages 'land,' not 'earth,' is the most probable rendering.

20. **Thou shalt subvert.** Cp. lxi. 7, cx. 5-7. The phrases 'subvert,' 'beat down' imply the figure of a house (cp. 'house of Israel' &c.). Zarephath and Jerahmeel, *i.e.* Edomites and N. Arabians, if they remain incorrigible, must be laid low (cp. xviii. 30, lii. 7, lx. 10, lxxxiii. 10-12,

cxxxvii. 8f.). On 'Mišsur' see *SBOT*, 'Isaiah,' Heb. p. 140.

22-28. Here the psalmist interposes; his tone is mild and persuasive. He appeals to the enemies to show a regard for their own true interest. Yahwè is a jealous God; let them propitiate him by becoming his faithful servants. He concludes with a declaration of the happiness of true believers, which is meant presumably for Gentiles as well as Jews—*i.e.* for those Gentiles (including even Edomites) who have found admission as proselytes into Yahwè's fold. The received text absurdly calls upon heathen kings to 'exult with trembling.' See crit. notes. [Grimm, *Liturg. App.*, 12 f., would omit l. 28 (*v.* 12c) as a 'euphemistic liturgical appendix,' which 'disturbs the parallelism, nor is it required by the context.' But in each stanza of seven lines there must be one line only loosely connected with the rest. It is barely possible, however, that אֲשֶׁר־וְנֹ has displaced the original close of the psalm.]

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. M רָנְשִׁי. A very doubtful Aramaism; cp. on lv. 15, lxiv. 3. Read קָשְׁרוּ. Lines 1-4 are quite consistent. First comes the plotting; then the mustering of the troops; then the watchword with which they take the field.—M רִיק; involves a premature statement. As in iv. 3, read שָׁקֵר, here = 'treason.'

3 f. M's יִתְצִבוֹ is right (see last note). Gr., La., We., Du. read יִי, following M of lxxxiii. 4 (but see note).—M מַלְכֵי; read יִרְחֲמֵאֵלִים. Pss. xlviii. and lxxxiii. are here our guides.—M רִיָּן. Read probably רָוּ = מַ. In itself, no doubt, is unobjectionable (though יִי would be more natural); cp. Ass. *ruzzunu*, with Prince, *J. B. L.*, xvi. 175 f. רִיָּנִים should probably be read in Judg. xvi. 30 &c.; and רִיָּן for נִוִּיר in Gen. xlix. 26, Dt. xxxiii. 16, Lam. iv. 7; also in Is. xliii. 27a. It is also found in Sirach xlv. 4 (|| שָׁרֵי גִוִּים).—M נִסְדֹּר יָחַד; יָחַד seems superfluous on the common theory of נִי, the meaning of which word, however, says Bâ., is 'uncertain.' A's ἐπαγγελία suggests a connection with סֹד. Sirach (xlii. 10), as represented, gives the form הַסְתִּיד (Hal. הַסְתוּד). This might suggest a denom. סוּד, but does not warrant נִסְדֹּר, which, in spite of S, ought not to be rendered 'take counsel.' G T suggest נִוְעֵד (so Gr., Lag., Gu.; cp. xlviii. 5). But both here and in lxxxiii. 4 (for יַעֲרִימוֹ סוּד we should probably read יַעֲרִכּוּ שְׂדֵר || יִתְצִבוֹ—M מִשִּׁיחוֹ. An early error for

חֲסִידוֹ (ח = מ, ש = ס, ח = ד). Cp. on xx. 7a, xxviii. 8, lxxxiv. 10, cv. 15. The error implies that the Messianic belief had gained strength since the completion of the Psalter.

10. M's text gives one beat too much, nor can יִדְבֵּר אֵל be said to be parallel to יִבְהַלְמוּ. Take one more suggestion from Ps. lxxxiii. (v. 16), and read יִרְדַּפּם בְּאִפּוֹ. Street and Bi.<sup>2</sup> read יִדְבֵּרִים, but the sense 'subdue' is very doubtful, and here does not suit the parallelism.

12. M אֲסַפְרָה אֶל-חֶק יְהוָה. But אֶל חֶק is surely not to be justified by the cases in which 'the ל of reference has become a new exponent of the accusative' (Kön., *Synt.*, p. 367); indeed the cases mentioned by Kön. (xxii. 31b, lxix. 27b, cx. 1) need testing. On the various ancient views of the text see Bā., *Jahrb. f. pr. Theol.*, 1882, p. 594. To amend אֶל אֶת (Houb., Kenn., Bi.<sup>2</sup>, We., Du. alt.) is too slight a remedy for the strangeness of the text. Where else is a divine oracle described as a חֶק? And why has the king to brace himself up to communicate the oracle? Next, we notice that, if we follow M's text, the second stanza will have one line too few, and the third one too many. Evidently 'אֲסַפְרָה וְנֹו', or that from which it may have been corrupted, should be transferred to the second stanza. It will also be observed that, according to the structure of the other stanzas, the three middle lines should form a tristich. We have, therefore, if possible, to detect underneath אֲסַפְרָה אֶל חֶק יְהוָה something which will form a tristich with lines 3 and 4, and will also fit in with the closing distich. The required words are מִחֶקֶק יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה (see exeg. note). The letters were misarranged and partly corrupted.

13 f. Of M's נִסְכֵּתִי Bā. frankly confesses that the meaning is 'again uncertain.' The Assyrian *nasīku*, 'prince,' may indeed mean properly 'one constituted,' but were the Israelites conscious that נִסְיָךְ, 'prince,' came from a root נִסַּךְ, 'to constitute'? 'AE' render נִסְכֵּתִי ἐδιασάμην, *J orditus sum*; but the sense of meaning is here unsuitable. Σ has ἔχρισα (T רִבִּיתִי); cp. Acts iv. 27. It is true that some (e.g. Ges.; We. *Heid.* 118) explain נִסְיָךְ as primarily 'one anointed'; but this is most questionable (see 'Anointing,' *Enc. Bib.*). Nor would 'I have anointed ... on Mount Zion' be natural; hence T inserts וּמִנִּיתִיָּה. Houb., Kenn., Street, Du. follow G (κατεστάθη βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ) in reading מַלְכוּ and קִדְשׁוֹ. It would be plausible to supplement this by reading נִסְכֵּדָתִי; cp. G in Prov. viii. 23 ἐθεμελίωσέ με = נִסְכֵּדָתִי? But, in spite of יִסְדֵּר in 1 Chr. ix. 22, this is hardly natural. The truth is that the traditional view of the close of the second stanza will not hold; it produces the effect of great abruptness. There must be deep corruption in the text. Not improbably we should read יַחְמַל-מִשְׁכְּנֵתִי יְהוָה; and in next line קִדְשׁוֹ לֵאלֹהִים (= עֵל) fell out. נִי, as often, = מ. ו in the suffix fell out.—16. M הַיּוֹם. The position of this word is unnatural. As often,

יום most probably disguises a longer word (cp. on lxi. 9, end). Read

20 f. Neither תרעם (M; cp. Lag., *Semitica*, i. 22 ff.) nor (lxxviii. 71 f.), as G S J, Ilgen, Lag., Now. read, is correct. The whole passage is highly inappropriate, and must be closely examined. Inspection reveals the following underlying passage:—

צִרְפָּת  
תִּתֶּן

22 f. The Jerahmeelites and the Zarephathites cannot be dismissed abruptly. ועתה מלכים has arisen out of יִרְחֲמֵאִלִים. Did the scribe begin to write יִרְחֲמֵ, and then remember that the transformed edition of the psalm had מלכים? שפט sometimes takes the place of צִרְפָּת; cp. on cix. 31, cxli. 6, and cp. 'Shaphat,' *Enc. Bib.* Similarly in Mic. iv. 14 צִרְפָּת has become יִשְׁבֵּט (see 'Micah, Book of,' *Enc. Bib.*). Read, in l. 23, |

25. M

ἀράσσει παιδείας, inserting לו, which might easily fall out after J too (see Lag.) may have read ונילו לו. But the invitation to exult (נילו) violates the parallelism, and is inconsistent with ברעדה. Nor is Lagrange's 'faites le cercle' (*Rev. Bibl.*, ix. 88) more than a palliating remedy. The phrase which follows is equally improbable. Hommel (*Aufsätze*, ii.) would have us render 'kiss ye (the god) Bir,' assuming Bir to have once been a designation of Yahwè as well as of Rammân. This has only the value of a record of Hommel's impression that such a pronounced Aramaism as בֵּר 'son' is inconceivable in a psalm where we also find בְּנֵי. Certainly the defences of the omission of the article offered by Del., Bâ., and Kön. are highly unnatural. 'Kiss a son' is nearly as senseless as 'kiss wheat' or 'kiss a pure one,' and in any case נשק 'to kiss' would require to be followed ל or (better) לְרִנָּה. Add to this that בר נשקו is rhythmically superfluous, and that the subject of the following verb is 'Yahwè.' In these circumstances it is useless to emend נילו into חילו (Ew. Gr.), which produces a tautology with רעדה (see xlvi. 7), or to change בר into בחיר (Ilgen; cp. 2 S. xxi. 6), or בו (Hu., against usage). The truth is that בר נשקו (where either בר should be בֵּר or else עדה has been accidentally lost) is a marginal correction of עדה נילו (לו) ברעדה, which has intruded into the text (*Jew. Rel. Life*, 1898, p. 112 note); so, subsequently,<sup>1</sup> Marti, Duhm, Prince (*J. B. L.* xix. 3). Thus we have two competing readings, נשקו and נילו. Neither is correct;

<sup>1</sup> K. H. Grimm's reference to this theory (*Liturg. App.* 13) warns me to point out that the priority is mine, and to ask consideration for -----

and ג' are both corrupt fragments of הַשְׁתַּחֲוֹי, to which לֹ (in should be added. Gr.'s החזיקו במוסר, and La.'s

), 'put on his bonds,' spoil the metre. Gr. appeals to G T; but G T really understand בר as = תֹּרָה. Duhm suggests וְשָׁחַ; this is insufficient for metre, and does scanty justice to the material supplied by M. Read, therefore, certainly, לֹ הַשְׁתַּחֲוֹי בְּרַעְדָּה. Note the warning Pasek after

26. M וְתִאֲבִדוּ דָרֶךְ. Though the accus. דָּרֶךְ is grammatically defensible (Kön.), the sense produced is poor. Herz, בְּדָרֶךְ. But to correspond to כַּמֶּעַט we require בְּרַנֵּעַ (ג' and כ' confounded, ב' and ')

## PSALMS III. AND IV.

Ps. iii. trimeters; Ps. iv. tetrameters. The opening psalms of the Ethanic Psalter, meant apparently for evening use, the Jewish day beginning with the evening. So Lagarde. The more common view, which makes Ps. iii. a morning and Ps. iv. an evening hymn, is in itself improbable, considering the similarity of the situation in the two psalms, and appears to have arisen out of a corruption in the text (see crit. note on iii., l. 9). Wellhausen, indeed, disagreeing alike with Lagarde and with Bähgen, thinks that the tenses in iii. 6 and iv. 9 are all to be treated as presents, and denies any special application to evening or morning (*Skizzen*, vi. 166); this, however, can hardly be called a natural view. Now as to the reference of the psalms. They presuppose certain troubles of the pious community, arising from the hostility of the neighbouring populations; the Arabians and Jerahmeelites (cp. lxxxiii. 7 f.) are specially mentioned. It is probable (cp. l.<sup>(3)</sup>) that there were many unworthy Jews who were in alliance with the non-Jewish oppressors; these appear to be referred to as 'deniers (of God)' in iv. 3 (cp. l. 22, corr. text). There is, however, no actual war at the present moment; the enemies are content with the deadly weapon of a lying tongue (iv. 3), which, perhaps, implies accusations brought by the Edomites against the pious Jews. The overlordship of Palestine apparently belongs to some third people (the Persians?). The plans of the enemy, however, have failed, and in the future too God will make them fail. The psalmist advises his opponents much as the author of Ps. ii. advises the Jerahmeelites (iv. 5 f.), but he is evidently most hopeful of touching the feelings of the Jews among them. He also meets the scoffs of contemptuous pessimists who are perhaps not open enemies; at least he tells us why these scoffs have no effect upon him (see on iv. 9-12). Ps. iii., ll. 1-12, records the prayer of pious Israel for Yahwè's help; ll. 13, 14, and (in the main) Ps. iv. its gratitude for deliverance. Whether this deliverance is some small event or the anticipated Messianic interposition is a question. But so much at least is certain—that the speaker is the pious community. No other theory is satisfactory. That pronounced egoist Nehemiah would certainly have introduced some personal touches.

The points of contact in ideas and phraseology between Ps. iii. and iv. are unmistakable. The second part of the title of Ps. iii., which as it stands is historically absurd (cp. 2 S. xviii. 31-33, xix. 1-4), when gently corrected in accordance with the text-critical parallels in other titles, is highly suitable to the contents of both psalms. Psalms parallel in contents are v.-vii., ix.-xiv., xvii., xxvii.<sup>(1)</sup>, lii.-lix. (see *OP*, 227), and lxii.

*Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. At the approach of the sons of Arabia and the sons of Ishmael.*

- I
- I O Yahwè ! how many are my foes ! 2  
 +How+ many there are who start up against me !  
 +How+ many there are who say to me, 3  
 'There is no help for thee in thy God !'  
 But thou, O Yahwè ! art a shield about me, 4  
 My pride, and the exalter of my state.  
 Unto thee, O Yahwè ! I cry ; 5 •  
 From thy holy mountain mayest thou answer me.  
 I have laid me down and shall fall asleep, 6  
 10 For the lovingkindness of Yahwè supports me.  
 I fear not the people of the Arabians 7  
 Who beset me round about.  
 1 Thou hast smitten all Arabia and Jerahmeel, 8  
 The Cushites [and] Geshurites thou hast scattered.

*Liturgical Appendix.*

- To Yahwè belongs +true+ help ; 9  
 Be thy blessing, O God ! upon thy people.

1-4. The utterance of an unwarlike, praying community. In *l.* 3 רַבִּים is commonly misunderstood. The speakers are persons *outside* the community of Israel. Cp. Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde*, 21. On their cruel speech cp. xlii. 4, 11, lxxi. 11.

6. **Of my state.** Lit. 'of my head.' Cp. Eccus. xi. 1, xx. 11, 1's. xxvii. 6, cx. 7.

9. In these troublous times peaceful sleep seems miraculous.

13. הִפִּיתָ is sometimes taken as an argument why God should help, =

'thou hast ere now smitten,' sometimes as a joyous outburst of faith = 'thou hast decreed to smite' (the perfect of confidence). A precative perfect (see Kön. § 172 f.) is also not impossible. From the perfect of confidence (cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 20) to the precative the transition is easy. Most probably, however, the perfect may be historical; in other words, the latter part of the psalm, which seems to have been imperfectly transmitted, may have been (like Ps. iv.) an expression of gratitude for deliverance.

17 f. Editorial and liturgical appendix (following Olshausen).

*Critical Notes.* Title. Read בְּקֶרֶב בְּנֵי עָרָב וּבְנֵי יִשְׁמַעֵאל. This is in harmony with the contents (iii. *l.* 11, iv. 3). The editor ingeniously adapted it to the corrupt לְדֹרֹךְ. Probably the true words were already in part miswritten. Cp. titles of Pss. vii., xviii.

<sup>1</sup> Arise, O Yahwè ! succour me, O my God ! for.

'Selahs.' The three 'Selahs,' vv. 3, 5, 9, are corruptions of | other cases will occur. סֵלָה is very often a mere corruption.

4. M T J לוֹ. Rather לָךְ (so S), corresponding to לִנְפְשִׁי, 'to my soul' = 'to me.' M בָּאלֹהִים; so T 'A S J. More suitably G Θ, בְּאֱלֹהֵיו. But best בְּאֱלֹהֶיךָ; so S. Cp. אֱלֹהֵי (insertion in ver. 8).

7 f. M קוֹלִי אֱלֹהֵי. ק' is generally regarded as a second subject. Cp. xvii. 10, xxvii. 7, lxvii. 17, lxxvii. 2 (?), cxlii. 2 (?). This is grammatically possible; the same idiom exists in Assyrian (Del., *Weltschöpfung*, 138). But in each of the above cases there is reason to hold that the text is corrupt. In our passage nothing is gained by the emphatic קוֹלִי, and the personal address to Yahwè is causelessly abandoned. Read אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה. אֱלֹהֵי and אֵל come from two imperfect fragments of אֱלֹהִים; כ became ק. As a consequence read תַּעֲנֵנִי and קִדְשָׁךְ יַעֲנֵנִי (M G S) is certainly wrong; יַעֲנֵנִי ('A E' S' J) is better.

9 f. M G שִׁכְבְּתִי אֲשַׁכֵּב is more natural (iv. 9). This is not an arbitrary emendation. The corruption presently to be mentioned involved altering אֲשַׁכֵּב.—M וְאִישָׁנָה. Read וְאִישָׁן. ה is dittographed (cp. Kön., *Synt.*, § 200b).—M הַקִּיצוֹתִי. 'ה nude positum displicet' (Lag.). Elsewhere (see xvii. 15b) we shall find חֲסֹדֶךָ corrupted into בְּהַקִּיץ. Comparing xciv. 18, read בִּי חֲסֹד י'.

11. M מְרַבֵּבוֹת עִם. An error which burdens the psalmist with a needless exaggeration. Read מִעַם עַרְבִים. Cp. a similar corruption in xliii. 1 and elsewhere; also xxvii. 3.

13 f. Omit v. 13a and כִּי in b as an editorial gloss (cp. Du.). Bi. would rather omit v. 8b. M has אֶת־כָּל־אֵיבֵי לָחִי. אֵיבִים in vii. 6, xxxi. 9, and elsewhere probably comes from עַרְבִים, 'Arabians,' and לָחִי (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Lehi') is one of the current distortions of יִרְחֵמָאֵל. Probably (cp. *L.* 11, iv. 2) we should read אֶת־כָּל־עַרְבֵי יִרְחֵמָאֵל. Note that T and S (S ?) read לָחִים (which Lag. adopts); G לְ[חֵנָם]. To strike on the cheek is an *insult*, not a deadly act (Job xvi. 20, Mic. iv. 14).—M שְׁנֵי רַשָּׁעִים שִׁבְרָתָ. Read perhaps וְאֲשָׁרִים פִּירָתָ (see on xlviii. 7b). נָשָׂר = אָשָׁר (Geshur).

# (PSALM IV.)

*Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

1 He answered me when I called— | the God who rights me; 2  
When the Jerahmeelites struck terror | he heard my prayer.

Ye deniers +of God,+ how long | will ye multiply insults? 3  
long+ will ye love falsehoods, | and seek for lies?

5 But mark how signal | is the kindness Yahwè has shown me ; 4  
Yahwè hears me | when I call upon him.

Take warning, perish not ; | show prudence in your ways: 5  
Offer sacrifices that are right, | and put your trust in Yahwè. 6

Many there are who say, | 'No more will good fortune visit  
them ! 7

10 God has veiled | the light of his countenance.'

O Yahwè ! thou hast put | gladness into my heart 8  
More than in the time of our corn | and our new wine and '  
our oil.

In peace will I at once | lay me down and sleep, ' 9  
For thou, O Yahwè, | caustest me to dwell securely.

2. Cp. iii. 3.—3. **Ye deniers (of God).** The phrase includes Jewish and non-Jewish believers (see Ps. xlix.). Much difficulty has been caused by 'sons of men (בְּנֵי אִישׁ) in the received text. The phrase is far too undistinctive to be correct. Lines 3–8 are a remonstrance analogous to that in ii. 10–12. *Will ye multiply.* M's text speaks of insults to a mysterious 'glory,' in which some see the royal or highpriestly dignity, others the national honour—i.e. the power of maintaining Israel's independence. But the whole phrase is suspicious (see below). The seeming parallel in lxii. 5 is no parallel; there too the text is corrupt. The 'insults' are presumably those expressed in iii. 3, iv. 7.

4. **Falsehoods . . . Hes.** Cp. on lxii.

5. False accusations appear to have been brought against the faithful Jews by their unfaithful brethren and by the non-Jewish populations, to conciliate the Persian (?) or perhaps Greek rulers.

5. 'Your intrigues are doomed to failure; my life exhibits a series of deliverances springing from the divine lovingkindness' (see on xvii. 7, xxxi.

22). On חֶסֶד cf. *OP*, 370 ff; *Enc.*

*Bib.*, 'Lovingkindness.' הפלה 'has separated, made unique.' Cp. Ex. xxxiii. 16, Israel is rendered unique by having Yahwè's attendant presence.

7, 8. **Take warning . . .** 'Reflect before it is too late, and your course ends in ruin. A time may come when prayers and sacrifices will be of no

avail (Prov. i. 28). Repent and offer sacrifices which are at once legal and morally valuable; the legal and the moral to our psalmist are one. The ordinary view, based on M, is most unsatisfactory. 'Let wholesome fear deter you from persisting in this course of action, which is nothing less than sinful' (Kirkp.). But how very vague an exhortation,—'Tremble and do not sin'! Contrast ii. 11. רָנוּ might just as well mean, 'Be angry.' It is true, Bishop Horsley (following G and Eph. iv. 26) adopts this, explaining, 'Do not let your anger carry you into overt acts of sin.' Unsuitable, no doubt; but would the psalmist have used language capable of being so explained?

9–12. The scoff of the enemy, and the pious community's answer. The enemy, who is established in the land of Israel, pronounces that the God of the land is angry with the Jews ('has veiled the light of his face'; cp. lxxx. 1, 4). Israel answers that it has but lately received a signal proof of the divine favour, which has given it an inward joy (l. 11; cp. l. 5), far greater even than that of the merry harvesters (cp. Hos. ix. 1, Isa. ix. 3). 'Although the fig-tree may not blossom . . . yet I will rejoice in Yahwè' (Hab. iii. 17 f.). Contrast Hos. vii. 14. On the text see crit. note. Ol. is certainly wrong in thinking that the anxious multitude of Israelites referred to, as he thinks, in v. 7a offer a prayer to Yahwè in v. 7b. This would be inconsistent with ll. 11 f.

*Critical Notes.* 1, 2. Lag. (with best MSS. of G) reads עֲנִי because of הִרְחַבְתָּ. This seems right, though the fact that 'הִר' is in the perfect is not conclusive. For though 'בַּצֵּר הִר' gives a plausible sense, the phrase is not only peculiar, but wanting in special appropriateness. We expect some point of contact with that part of Ps. iii. in which Israel's trouble is referred to (v. 7). 'הִר is plainly wrong, and the superfluous הֲנִי ought to help towards correcting the text. We want an ethnic name virtually equivalent to עֲרָבִים (iii. 7). With חֲנִים (מ = נִי) and רַחֲבַת before us, we cannot doubt that the name is יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. Read, therefore, in *l. 2a*, 'בְּעֶרְץ יִר', and for וְשָׁמַע read שָׁמַע.

3. M בְּנֵי אִישׁ. Read הַמְכַחְשִׁים (see on xlix. 3).—M לְכַלְמָה ; בְּבִדִי also S 2. G, כְּבִדִי לֵב לָמָּה ; 'A J, בְּבִדִי לְכַלְמָה (see Lag.). Disregarding metre, Houb., Bredenk. (*Gesetz u. Proph.*, 71), We., and Roy (p. 58) follow G. Both readings are awkward, and produce a bad parallelism. Read תִּרְבּוּ כְלָמָת. M's סֵלָה is a corruption of כְּלָמָה, repeated in error from the preceding line.—4. M רִיק. Parallelism requires שָׁקֵר (ii. 1).

5f. Read חֲסְרוּ לִי (xxx. 22), with Hare (in Horsley), Dy., Gr., Che.<sup>1</sup>, Kau., We., Herz.—M יִשְׁמַע. For clearness read יִשְׁמַעֲנִי (G, Bi.). Note of abbreviation lost.

7. M וְאֵל־תַּחֲטָאוּ אִמְרוּ, in connection with which וְדַמּוּ must be taken, for it is really a second corruption of the word, which has also been corrupted into תַּחֲטָאוּ and into אִמְרוּ. Similarly עַל־מִשְׁכַּבְכֶּם and בִּלְבַבְכֶּם are both corruptions of the same word. רָנוּ is of course also wrong; the obviously correct word is הִוָּסְרוּ (ii. 106). The three words 'תַּח, אִמְרוּ, and דַּמּוּ are corruptions of תַּאֲבָדוּ. In 'תַּח, ח has come out of ב, and ט out of ד; in אִמְרוּ, מַר = בַּד; in דַּמּוּ, דַּמ = דַּב. In בִּלְבַבְכֶּם comes from עַל. עַל־מִשְׁכַּבְכֶּם is, perhaps, a corruption of עַל־מַעְגְּלֵיכֶם; ע became ש, נ became כ, ל became ב.

Note that G 2 omit ו before דַּמּוּ; S (rightly) prefixes it to עַל. דַּמּוּ might of course be retained in the sense of 'be silent in penitence,' but this would require עַל־עֹפֶר. The explanation given above is adequate and supported by numerous parallels elsewhere. M's סֵלָה is a corrupt fragment of הַשְׂכִּילוּ (ii. 10a), the parallel to הוֹסְרוּ. Read therefore—

9f. M יִרְאֵנוּ. Rather יִרְאֵם; נוּ and מ confounded.—M נִסָּה. T renders נִשָּׂא, to which most (*e.g.* Kön. i. 631) assent. But the imperative is שָׂא; נִסָּא in x. 12 is corrupt. Here too there is corruption.



We might read נִשְׁתָּ = נִשְׁתָּא (parallels in Nu. xi. 11; Job i. 21). But a break in the parallelism is unpleasing. Budde (*T. L. Z.*, 1896, col. 561) derives from Pesh. the reading נִסָּה for נִסָּה, and פָּנִי for פָּנִי. This is both easy and probable. But עֲלֵינוּ remains unaccounted for. It is, however, one of the many corruptions of אֱלֹהִים, which restore, and the text will be in order.

11 f. Prefix יְהוָה from ver. 7 (so S). For מִן (twice) read נִי. נִי and נִי are frequently confounded with מִן. After the corn and wine G S mention the oil. Accordingly insert וַיִּצְהָרְנִי (Gr. מִן). Omit רְבוּ, which comes from a dittographed רְנוּ. רְנוּ was early found difficult (Judah ben Bileam in I E).

14. Omit לְבָרֵךְ (M G), a corruption of לְבָרֵךְ (Lag.), which in turn is a corruption of a duplicated לְבַטַּח. To keep both לְבָרֵךְ and לְבַטַּח, rendering 'solitarily+but+securely' (cp. Dt. xxxiii. 28 and parallels), does not give a good sense. Israel at this time did not dwell 'solitarily,' *i.e.* free from the intrusion of other peoples (Ol.). Nor can לְבָרֵךְ be referred to Yahwè, for it adds nothing to the force of the sentence to say that Yahwè had no allies. Duhm deserves credit for omitting לְבָרֵךְ, but his view that it is a Judaistic gloss ('Israel, and no other nation') is improbable.

## PSALM V.

**PENTAMETERS.** According to the received text, a prayer of the inner circle of pious Jews which gathers at the morning and evening sacrifices to ask for guidance and for the overthrow of Israel's foes. The enemies spoken of might be of Jewish blood—men who from time to time presented themselves in the temple for a formal worship which had no effect on their daily life (Ps. l. 16). And certainly it cannot be denied that such persons are included under the class-names 'wicked doers,' 'speakers of lies,' &c. But the leaders of the opposition to the Jews commemorated in this and other psalms are the Jerahmeelites and other neighbouring peoples. The prospect is Messianic. The speaker is pious Israel; the expression 'my king' (v. 3) is of itself almost enough to show this; even in Sirach li. 1 (quoted on the other side by Beer) it is the community which speaks. Merx's view (Chwolson's *Festschrift*) that the speaker is a priest in the Maccabæan period, who owns no king but Yahwè, is precluded by the corrected text (see on v. 4). Cp. Roy, *Volks-gemeinde*, 59. Pss. xv., xxiv.<sup>(1)</sup>, and l.<sup>(2)</sup>, also xxvi., xxviii., and xxviii., contain parallels to our psalm.

*Deposited. Of Salmath. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

1 Harken to my words, O Yahwè ! | heed my meditation ; 2<sup>\*</sup>  
Listen to the sound of my crying, | my King and my God ! 3

For against me Jerahmeel draws near, | his voice he  
makes to be heard ;<sup>1</sup> 3b, 4

Jerahmeel has pleasure in wickedness, | he fears no calamity.

5

<sup>1</sup> Jerahmeel and Zarephath draw near.

The impious cannot stand up | before thine eyes ;<sup>1</sup> 6  
 Thou abhorrest those that speak lies, | those of Edom  
 and Jerahmeel. 7  
 But I, so great is thy lovingkindness, | can enter thy  
 house, 8  
 I can bow down toward thy holy temple, | revering thee.  
 O Yahwè ! lead me in thy righteousness | because of  
 Ishmael : 9  
 10 Make thy way even before me | \* \*  
 For there is no sincerity in their speech, | insults are  
 • +in+ their heart ; 10  
 An open grave is their throat, | +though+ they speak  
 flatteringly.  
 Bring destruction on them, O God ! make foolish | [all]  
 their counsels ; 11  
 Push them down for their many crimes, | for they have  
 defied thee.  
 But let all that trust in thee rejoice, | for ever let them  
 shout, 12  
 Let all that love thy name be glad, | and exult in thee.  
 For thou, O Yahwè ! blessest | the righteous [with  
 lovingkindness] ; 13  
 [Him that trusts in the Most High]—with favour | thou  
 crownest him.

1. **My king**, *i.e.* Israel's king. See xlv. 5, Isa. xxxiii. 22, xli. 21, xliii. 15. See introd.

3. **Jerahmeel draws near**. Cp. iii. 7, iv. 2, xxvii. 2, &c. The reference in M to the morning sacrifice (?) is enigmatical. Not less so is the phrase 'I will look out.' Not patient waiting (Mic. vii. 7, Hab. iii. 1), but impatient importunity is the fundamental tone of this psalm. *His voice*. The loud cries of these enemies are often referred to (xlv. 17, lxxiv. 4, &c.).

4. Cp. x. 6, lv. 23 (?). M's יגד is very improbable.

5. **The impious**. If we adhere to M's הוללים we had best render 'mockers.' The Aphel of the verb in

Syr. means 'to mock,' and T gives the synonym מלעבין (cp. מלעבים, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 16). But the sense is not perfectly satisfactory (see lxxiii. 3, lxxv. 5). G's παρὰνομοι (so also lxxv. 5, but in lxxiii. 3, ἄνομοι) is vague. B D B explains 'boasters,' but does not the sense 'to boast' belong to a different root? (see Ges. - Bu.). 'Madmen' would perhaps be better (cp. Poel and Hithpoel). It is very doubtful, however, whether any ethical sense was developed out of הלל; in Ass. the only ethical sense is 'pure, holy.' It is better, therefore, to suppose an error of the text. See crit. n., and for נבל see on xiv. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Thou hatest all wicked doers.

7. **I ... can enter thy house.** Cp. on Ps. xv. Sinners have to fear the 'fire in Zion' (Isa. xxxi. 9; cp. Isa. xxxiii. 14). But the speaker, not being of the class just described, can safely enter Yahwè's courts, which are indeed his fortress (xxvii. 4 f.).

8. **I can bow down &c.** See on xxviii. 2.

9. **Lead me ...** Yahwè is the shepherd of Israel, whom he leads in the right paths—those which he has prescribed (so Ol., Du.). See on xxv. 5, xxvii. 11. So 'thy way' = the way in which I should walk (cxliii. 8).

'Make' it 'even,' says pious Israel, i.e. free from calamity (xxvi. 12, Isa. xxvi. 7), lest the neighbouring peoples should say, 'Where is thy God?'

16. **All that love thy name;** so xxv. 14<sup>b</sup> (corr. text), lxix. 37, cxix. 132. The 'name of Yahwè' is his glory, or the place where his glory dwells, and to love it is to honour it (exclusively) by ceremonial acts.

17. **The righteous,** צַדִּיק, i.e. the faithful community. Cp. vii. 10, xxxi. 19, lviii. 11 f., lxxv. 11, Isa. xxiv. 16, xxvi. 7.

*Critical Notes.* 1. מ הִנֵּנִי. The Rabbis assumed two Heb.\* roots meaning 'to murmur, meditate' (הִנֵּה and הִנֵּנִי). Certainly there is a Syr. root הִנֵּנִי (*O P*, 464). But here, as in xxxix. 4, corruption is very probable. Read הִנֵּנִי (xix. 15).

4. The whole of v. 4 is corrupt. Herz, indeed, would (most ingeniously) read, for בִּקְרָא וְעֶרֶב, בִּקְרָא אַעֲרֶךְ. But this is not enough. The speaker is in deadly peril; to refer to his morning and evening oblations is unnatural. Merx (*Chwols. Festschrift*) renders 'I arrange and cleanse for thee' (Arabising), supposing an allusion to a ritual practice. Cp. Lagarde (*Psalt. Gr.*, 34 ff.) and Duhm. Read probably פִּי עָלִי יִרְחַמְאֵל קָרֵב הַשְּׂמִיעַ קוֹלִי. So historical colouring is restored. At end of v. 4 read קָרַבְנִי יִרְחַמְאֵל וְצִרְפָּת (a variant).

4. M's אֵל לֹא כִי (Pasek after כִּי) is one of the many disguises of יִרְחַמְאֵל.—For יִנָּרֵךְ read יִנָּרֵךְ (see exeg. note).

5. For הוֹלִלִים read probably נִבְלִים, a class-name which could hardly be omitted here. נִבְלִים is corrupted elsewhere. At end of v. 6 M inserts a gloss.

6. תִּתְאַבֵּר is too strong; destruction is referred to later. Read תִּתְעַבֵּב (תִּתְעַבֵּב represents this as a correction). יְהוָה is superfluous. For אִישׁ דְּמִים וּמְרָמָה read אֲדָמִים וִירְחַמְאֵלִים (cp. on li. 16, lv. 24).

9. מ שׁוֹרְרִי. Again in xxvii. 11, liv. 7, lvi. 3, lix. 11. *G* ἐχθροί μου. *Σ* ἀποθλίβοντές με. But an ethnic name is wanted; read either נְשׁוּרִים or, better, יִשְׁמַעְאֵל (see on lix. 11<sup>b</sup>).

11. M בִּפְיָהוּ. Read, with the Vss., בִּפְיָהֶם Du.; less correctly, בִּפְיָמוֹ, Lag., Bā., We., Merx.—M נִכְוָהָה. Read נִכְוָחָה (Gr.); cp. Isa. lix. 14.—M הוֹוֹת. Rather חֲרָפוֹת. So xxxviii. 14, lii. 4, cp. lxii. 7. 3. The contrast is between words of simulated friendliness and the insults of open hostility. See lxii. 5.

13. M הָאֲשִׁימָם. Read, more suitably, הַשְּׂמִים (Lag., Gr., Merx);

cp. Joel i. 18, where read נִשְׁמוּ (Merx, We.).—M יָפְלוּ כַמְעֻצֹתֵיהֶם; a strange expression. Dy. and We., יָפִילוּם מ'; too superficial. Read סָפַל כָּל־; see 2 S. xv. 31, Isa. xlv. 25.—M בָּרַב. Better כָּרַב (G J); so Du., Merx.

16. M וְתִסְדַּר עֲלֵינוּ וְיַעֲלֵנוּ. We. makes sense by omitting the first ו, and treating 'על' as a relative clause. But this is unnatural. The caesura in the verse should be at יִרְנֵנוּ (cf. Isa. lii. 8). עֲלֵינוּ is surely a dittogram of יַעֲלֵנוּ. וְתִסְדַּר must be corrupt; it should represent a verb parallel to יַעֲ. We expect יִשְׁעֵנוּ (xl. 17). ד may have sprung from ו, and both ס and ת from ש. The wrong reading was natural when the dittographed יַעֲ had become עֲלֵינוּ. Herz, וְתִסְדַּר עֲלֵנוּ.

17f. Insert חֶסֶד (metre and parallelism); also perhaps בִּטְחָא בְּעֵלְיוֹן. Omit כִּצְנָה (an unsuitable figure). Wellh. proposes צִנְפָה. But כִּצְנָה comes probably from בְּרָצֹן; בְּרָצֹן which follows is a correct variant. Point תַּעֲמִידֵנוּ.

## PSALM VI.

**TRIMETERS.** A record of still deeper depression (cp. Ps. xxxviii., and the thanksgiving in Ps. xxx.). The trouble from the foreign (and native) enemies is now at its height. The sufferer owns himself guilty, but has no clear comprehension of his guilt (l. 2). He has been constant in the recital of Yahwe's praises (ll. 9 f.), and in consequence appeals to Yahwe's reasonableness:—if the speaker should actually sink into the nether world, what would become of those songs of praise and thanksgiving in which He delights (cp. xxx. 10, 13)? The speaker is well-nigh exhausted. His bodily frame is wasted away, and even at night his tears cease not to flow. That literal sickness (Lwald, B. Jacob, Duhm) is not meant, ought to be clear. It is the insults (l. 18) of the speaker's foes which have robbed him of the joy of life. Nor is it an individual who speaks. It is a fact (in spite of Sellin, *De Origine*, 27 ff.; see notes below on ll. 1, 4) that expressions partly the same and partly similar are put into the mouth of Israel, and we know that Hebrew writers could go to a great length in personifying their people, and even an association of persons within their people (Isa. liii. 1, Ps. xxii.). The case is exactly parallel to that of Ps. xli., about the interpretation of which there can be no reasonable doubt. That individual Israelites, who felt the sorrows and sufferings of their nation as their own, would put much personal feeling into their recitation of this psalm, is a matter of course; but the 'I' who speaks is primarily faithful Israel, not any Israelite, and least of all a sick Israelite. The sickness is quickly put aside; the enemies are the enemies of Israel and of Israel's moral standards—'wrong doers,' led by Arabians from the border lands.

There are still critics who hold to the individualistic interpretation, which shows a want of insight into the numerous passages in which Israel is certainly not personified by a poetical figure, but rather regarded as in reality a living organism, in accordance with the primitive sense of the solidarity of all the members of a community. That the early Israelites, like the early Babylonians, had songs of sickness, is probable enough. But that sick persons, either in pre-exilic or (much less) in post-exilic times, used this or any of our psalms when they came to offer a propitiatory sacrifice, is a view which requires far more argument than B. Jacob has offered for it (*ZATW*, 1897, p. 56); this scholar actually seems to think that Ps. vi. and parallel psalms may have been written for lepers. To some it appears more plausible to suppose that this and other psalms were originally individualistic,

but have been converted into psalms of the community (Laue, *Die Ebed Jahwe Lieder*, p. 52; Coblenz, 165). This, however, is surely a modified survival of the old church view that the psalms were composed by great (inspired) individuals with reference to their own circumstances, and is unsatisfactory. Such individualistic psalms as exist in the Psalter are unmistakable; psalms of mixed character do not exist. And it should never be forgotten (against B. Jacob) that the individualism which may be found in the Psalter is coloured by the strongest Israelite feeling. Mere personal misfortunes are not, and could not be, referred to in the Psalter.

*Deposited; of the Ethanites. Marked: of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

- 1 O Yahwè! use not thine anger to punish me, 2  
 Nor thy fury to chastise me.  
 Revive me, O Yahwè! for I languish, 3  
 Heal me,<sup>1</sup> for my frame is wasted.  
 My soul too is greatly affrighted; 4  
 And thou, O Yahwè! how long?  
 Return, O Yahwè! rescue my soul; 5  
 Deliver me for thy lovingkindness' sake!  
 For in Deathland there is none that recites thy praises; 6  
 10 In Sheol who will give thee thanks?

- [Yea,] I am worn out with sighing. 7  
 Every night I drench my bed;  
 I bathe my couch in my tears.  
 Mine eye is sunken with sorrow; 8  
 It perishes with the insulting of the Mişrites.  
 Away, all ye wrong doers; 9  
 20 Yahwè hears the sound of my weeping.  
 Yahwè hears my supplication; 10  
 Yahwè receives my prayer.  
 Be they shamed and sore terrified; 11  
 In a moment be all mine enemies put to shame!

1. Nearly as in xxxviii. 2. Both passages are dependent on Jer. x. 24. Note that in Jer. x. 19-25 (probably post-exilic) the speaker is Israel. The expressions are startling, but the idea of 'covenanted mercies' is an advance upon

the primitive idea of God's unreasonable and excessive irascibility.

4. **Heal me.** A figurative expression. The wounds referred to are the calamities of the people, viewed as the punishment of sin (xli. 3). It is true,

in Jer. xvii. 14 an individual appears to utter the same prayer; but we can hardly doubt that Jer. xvii. 5-14 is a late insertion in Jeremiah, and certainly the indications in the present context all point to pious Israel as the speaker. Cp. also Ex. xv. 26, Isa. vi. 10, xxx. 26, lvii. 18 f., Hos. vii. 1, xi. 3.—*My frame*, lit. 'my bones.' So xxxi. 11, xxxii. 3, xxxv. 10, xxxviii. 4, li. 10; cp. Lam. i. 13, iii. 4, Heb. iii. 16. Cp. the use of עֲצָם for *res ipsa*.

7. **Rescue my soul.** Cp. in Ass. *šuzubu napišta*, 'to rescue the soul, or life.'

9. **Is Deathland.** מוֹת 'death,' is a synonym for Sheol (ix. 13, xxii. 16, lxviii. 20, lxxxix. 49, cvii. 18; cp. Rev. i. 18, vi. 1, xx. 13 f.—*None that recites*. Thanksgiving for His lovingkindnesses

was Yahwè's favourite 'sacrifice' (l. 14). The continued existence of Israel was, therefore, assured. See Isa. xxxviii. 18 (Israel is the speaker, and the same figure of sickness is employed). Cp. *OP*, 385.

14 ff. **I am worn out**... Jer. xlv. 3 is parallel. An individual (Baruch) is there referred to; but the passage looks as if it had been framed on the basis of psalm-passages (cp. 'Jeremiah,' *Enc. Bib.*). Pious Israel, imagined as an individual, could certainly be said to 'bathe his couch in his tears;' cp. lxix. 4, and note that in lxiii. 7 pious Israel says that he 'remembers God upon his bed.'

15 f. Observe that the Misrites (= Arabians) are the leaders of the party whom Israel regards as opposed to righteousness. Cp. on Ps. xi.

**Critical Notes.** 3. M הִנֵּנִי. Read חִנֵּנִי (Gr.). See on xli. 5—M כִּי אִמְלֵל אֲנִי. Whether we take אִמְלֵל as an adjective or as a participle without preformative, the form is unique and improbable. In spite of the grammatical remarks of Del. and Kön. (i. 247; ii. 375), it is hard to believe that אִמְלֵל, if genuine, is not 3 sing. perf. The occurrences of אִמְלֵל elsewhere are numerous: 1 S. ii. 5, Isa. xvi. 8 (see *SBOT ad loc.*), xix. 8, xxiv. 4, 7, 9, xxxiii. 9, Jer. xiv. 2, xv. 9, Hos. iv. 3, Joel i. 10, 12, Nah. i. 4 (read דָּלְלוּ אֶלְנִי בִשְׁן וְאִמְלְלוּ פֶרְחִי לְבִנּוֹן; see Gray and Che., *Exp.* Sept.-Oct. 1898), Lam. ii. 8. There is no adjective אִמְלֵל, Neh. iii. 34 being corrupt (see Guthe in *SBOT*; cp. Che., *Enc. Bib.*, 'Sanballat'). Read either כִּי־אִמְלֵלִי (transposing אֲנִי), אִיָּה being absorbed in pronunciation by חִנֵּנִי, or כִּי־אִמְלֵלִי, supposing אֲנִי to be a fragment of a second superfluous רִפְאֵנִי. In the latter case אִמְלֵלִי was written אִמְלֵל, whence אִמְלֵל.

4 f. Omit יְהוּדָה. Twice in two stanzas is often enough. Metre gains.—M גְּבִיָּה־לִּי (cp. l. 5). Read בָּלִי (Brüll, Hal.). See xxxii. 3.—M נִפְשִׁי. Read probably אֶף־נִפְשִׁי. אֶף easily dropped out before נִפְ, and י was supplied.

7, 9. Read שׁוֹבֵה־יְהוָה.—M זָכָרְךָ. Read מִזְכָּרְךָ (lxxi. 16); G, ὁ μνη-  
μοεύων σε. Bi., זָכָרְךָ.

14 f. Prefix בִּם (Bi.), for metre.—18. M בְּכָל־. Read בְּכָל־מַת (see on vii. 2, lxxxix. 51), with Bi. Notice כָּל in l. 19.—M צָרָרִי. Read probably מְצָרִים (analogy of other psalms).—M אֲשַׁחֲהָ. Wellh. suggests אֲשַׁחֲד 'I melt' (from the Syriac).

20 f. M שָׁמַע (twice). Read יִשְׁמַע (Gr.); י precedes.

24. M יִשְׁבֹּר; clearly by transposition from יִבְשׁוּ (a dittogram). G already had יִשְׁבֹּר; A even insert εἰς τὰ

## PSALM VII.—I.

**TRIMETERS.** The same theme of persecution. The aggressors (who are here personified) may have accused the Jewish community of misdeeds of which it is innocent. The faithful members of the community clear themselves by an oath, not unlike the great 'oath of clearance' in Job xxxi.; the duties which it claims to have performed are those which a late prophetic writer presses on the attention of the formal religionists who unhappily cling to the post-exilic community (Isa. lviii. 2). Note the points of contact between *zv.* 13 f. and xi. 2; between *zv.* 6 (end) and Lam. ii. 11; and between *v.* 2 (my pursuer) and Lam. v. 2, where the 'pursuers' are, as here, the peoples to the S. and S.E. of Judah (cp. *l.* 9, 'Let the Arabian pursue'). For the personification of the enemies, cp. Pss. ix.—x., lv. Lines 23, 24 may be a later insertion (see, however, note). According to Duhm, the contending parties are two heads of irreconcilable parties among the post-exilic Jews. The one seeks to destroy the other, because he believes himself to have been injured by him, while this one protests his innocence. Religion 'plays not much more than a decorative rôle.' A grievous disparagement of a perfectly sincere hymn to Yahwè! Riehm thinks it a plausible view that David, who protests his innocence towards Saul in 1 S. xxiv. 12 f., 16, xxvi. 18, 23 f., composed the psalm towards the end of his wanderings. Surely this need not be criticized. The only question is, did it suggest the heading? If so, we must read 'Saul ben Kish' (instead of 'Cush'). Another possibility would be 'Shimei ben Kish,' or even 'Mordecai, ben Shimei, ben Kish' (Esth. ii. 5). That David foresaw Mordecai, is mentioned in Targ. *sheni* on Esther. On these points, see *OP*, 229, 243. It is probable, however, that those parts of the headings which, as they now stand, suggest occasions in the life of David for the composition of psalms, are not always pure guesses, but, when most wide of the mark, arise out of misunderstood and misread earlier headings.

In the Masechet Sopherim xviii. 2 it is stated that this psalm was used at the feast of Purim (one name of which was ἡ Μαρδοχαικὴ ἡμέρα, 2 Macc. xv. 36.) Cp. on Ps. xxx.

*the Ethanites. Of 'Arab-ethan. With reference to the  
Arabians, the Cushites, the Jerahmeelites.* 1

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1  | In thee, O my God Yahwè! I take refuge;      | 2 |
|    | Deliver me from the insults of my pursuer;   |   |
|    | Lest he tear my living body as a lion,       | 3 |
|    | Rending it when none doth rescue.            |   |
|    | My God Yahwè! if I have plotted crimes,      | 4 |
|    | If any injustice mark my hands,              |   |
|    | If I have robbed the destitute of his cloak, | 5 |
|    | And not covered the flesh of the naked,      |   |
|    | Then let the Arabian pursue my soul,         | 6 |
| 10 | [Let him press after it], and overtake it,   |   |
|    | Let him trample my life to the earth,        |   |
|    | And pour out my liver into the dust.         |   |

*Supplement.*

- Surely again he whets his sword, 13  
 His bow he has bent and made ready ;  
 Deadly weapons at me doth he aim, 14  
 His shafts to press me hard he prepares.  
 Truly, with malice he may travail, 15  
 Mischief he may conceive, but delusion will be its issue.  
 A pit he may dig and hollow out, 16  
 20 But into the pitfall he makes he will tumble.  
 \* On his own pate his mischief will return, 17  
 On his own skull his injustice will descend.  
 I will give thanks unto Yahwè according to his  
 righteousness, 18  
 And chant hymns to the name of Yahwè for ever.

2. **My pursuer.** See introd.

3. **My living body,** נַפְשִׁי. See Kön. *Synt.* § 30.—*As a lion.* Cp. x. 9, xvii. 12, xxii. 14, 22, lvii. 5, Isa. v. 29.—5 דָּרָךְ with הַשֵּׁנִי, as xviii. 38.

7 f. **If I have robbed** . . . Cp. xxxiv. 11b ; the enemy does that which the speaker indignantly disclaims having done. 'Cloak,' cp. Am. ii. 8a, Dt. xxiv. 17b.—*And not covered* . . . Cp. Isa. lviii. 7, Job xxxi. 19 f.

10–12. **Soul, life, liver,** are here synonymous (see on xvi. 9).—*Pour out* ; cp. Lam. ii. 11.

13. **Surely again** . . . אִם-לֹא יִשׁוּב. Pious and unwarlike Israel sees the Arabians preparing for a fresh attack (cp. xvii. 11). He is assured by his faith that it will be futile. Yahwè's 'righteousness' (l. 23) will soon be manifested in a great retribution (the Messianic). It is true most translators, both ancient and modern, render, 'If he (the wicked man) turns not, he (God) whets his sword. . . . (But) behold, he (the wicked man) travails with mischief,' &c. These changes of subject, however, are very awkward ; Bā., Beer ('94), We., Kön. *Synt.* 355, 567), and, lately, Duhm, explain as above. Metre, in fact, positively requires this. After the inserted passage (vii.<sup>(2)</sup>) has been removed, אִם-לֹא יִשׁוּב connects itself naturally with the protestation in ll. 9–12, as Bickell has pointed out.

But surely we must also read וְלִי for וְאֵלַי in l. 15. Otherwise, after וְאֵלַי וְעַם, it would be most natural to render אִם-לֹא יִשׁוּב 'if he (the wicked man) does not turn,' in spite of the fact that the remainder of the passage is opposed to this view. For the figure of the arrows, cp. xi. 2.

16. **To press me hard** (see crit. n.). Most moderns render M, 'His arrows he makes into flaming ones,' and find a reference to the fire-charged darts (cp. Eph. vi. 16) hurled by the enemy into a besieged town in Greek and Roman times. Difficult and far-fetched in the extreme. It would be more plausible to find a reference to Yahwè's arrows, the lightnings (xviii. 15), if Yahwè were the warrior intended. But even then the construction would remain difficult. In the corrected text יַעֲרֵל is || to הִכִּין, as פִּעֵלַת is || to כֹּונֵנוּ יָדִיד in Ex. xv. 17, and לִי is explained by לְדַלְקָנִי.—17 f. Cp. Job xv. 35.

19. Fraud is often, apparently, the chief weapon of the enemies of the psalmists. *Pit, net, snare* are their favourite figures. This points to a time when the outrages of the N. Arabians had to some extent been checked.

23 ff. This couplet may *possibly* be a later liturgical insertion which has displaced the original closing couplet. But this is not strictly necessary ; the



psalmist is himself a liturgical poet.—*His righteousness*, soon to be manifested in act (see on xi. 7a).—*For ever*. We must remember that the speaker is the community (cp. on ix. 3) which never dies. The traditional text, however, has יְהוָה עֲלֵינוּ, an appositional phrase (cp. lvii. 3). On עֲלֵינוּ, Elyōn, see 'Names of God,' *Enc. Bib.* Elyōn, or El Elyōn, is a favourite divine name with post-exilic writers. We must not, however, assume with Geiger (*Urschr.*,

82 ff.) that θεὸς ὑψίστος in the Apocrypha always = El Elyōn; it may mean either this or אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַיִם (see B. Jacob, *ZATW*, 1896, 147. The occurrence of Elyōn in a psalm would be a subsidiary argument for post-exilic date (cf. *Ps.* (1) 18; *OP*, 83 f.); Davison and other English objectors have erred in not frankly recognizing this. Hitzig's rendering (so G. Hoffm., *Phön. Inschr.*, 50) is not possible in the Psalter. Cp. Nestle, *Marginalien*, pp. 32–34.

*Critical Notes.* Title. Tradition is wholly wrong. אֲשֶׁר־שֵׁר comes from רָשָׁם 'marked' (like מִזְמֹר and שִׁיר). לַיהוָה probably comes from לְאִיתָן, a correction of לְדָוִד (= לְעֶרְבֵי אִיתָן = לִידִיתָן). עַל־דְּבָרֶיךָ is from כּוֹשׁ בְּרִימִינִי יֶרְחֶמְאֵל וּבְנֵי יֶרְחֶמְאֵל (cp. 1 S. ix. 1, 4, same corruption). G's χουρεῖ attests כּוֹשִׁי (Cornill), a relic of כּוֹשִׁים.

2. M מְכַלֵּל. Read מְכַלְמֶת (see on vi. 8).—M רִדְפִי. Read רִדְפִי (Gr.).

4. M פָּרַק 'snatching away'? So Hu., Bā., but against usage. (On פָּרַק, G ἀδικία, Nah. iii. 1, see note on xvii. 4.) 'Setting free' is possible (cp. on xlvii. 5, cxxxvi. 24). If we adopt this, we must either prefix וְאִין, following G S (so Kenn., Str., Bi., Gr., Che., Sta., We., Du.), or else read פָּרַק אִין (cp. Lam. v. 8), cp. Bā. The text seems corrupt. Read (Hos. xiii. 8).

5. M אֶסְעֶשֶׂיתִי זֹאת. For זֹאת Gr. reads זָמָה (|| עוֹל). But the corruption lies deeper. Read אֶסְחָשְׁבֶתִי מִזְמוֹת.

7 f. M אֶסְגְּמִלְתִּי שְׁלֹמִי רָע. As the text now stands, זֹאת is the object at once of נִמְלִיתִי and of שָׁלַם = מָשַׁל (Ol.). This cannot be right. The next line is equally difficult. M's וּאֶחְלָצָה is defended by Bā. But can we venture to give the Aram. sense 'despoil' (cp. 2 ἀνήκτα) to the common Hebrew word חָלַץ? G has ἀποέσθαι (?). Following T S, Houb., Kr., Dy., Gr., Che., Du., read וּאֶחְלָצָה. This is at any rate better than giving ו an adversative sense (so Kön., *Synt.*, § 360c), and treating v. 5b as parenthetical. But the corruption is more deeply seated than we have ventured to suppose. However it be rendered, the sense of the distich cannot be called satisfactory. What we require to account for ll. 9–12 is a repudiation of accusations of hateful crimes. Read *probably* אֶסְגְּמִלְתִּי שְׁמִלַת רָשׁ וּבִשֶׁר עָרוֹם לֹא־כִסִּיתִי. The letters were mixed up and corrupted, as so often. (In l. 7 Str. and Herz have both suggested רָע שְׁלֹמִי.)

9 f. M יִרְדֵּף, a combination of two readings, יִרְדֵּף and יִרְדֵּף; tradi-

tion vacillated. So Pinsker (Del., *Psalmen*); cp. Kön., ii. 563. אֵיב should, as often, be עֶרְבִי. Read, as l. 10, יִדְבֵק אַחֲרַיָּה וְיִשָּׁג. Cp. Duhm.

12. M וּכְבוֹדִי. Read וּכְבִּדִי (see on xvi. 9); so Houb.—M יִשְׁבֵּן; the sense 'depressit' or 'projecit' (Ges.-Röd., *Thes.*) is arbitrary. Read יִשְׁפֹּךְ (Houb., Kenn., Str.); see Lam. ii. 11. In Sir. xliii. 19<sup>a</sup> the Cairo text has יִשְׁכֹּן, the marg. יִשְׁפֹּךְ.

16f. M וְלוֹ. Read וְלִי (see above).—M לְדִלְקִים. Read לְדִלְקִנִּי (Lam. iv. 19).—24. M עֲלִיּוֹן, a corruption of עֹלָם[ל]. Cp. on ix. 3.

## PSALM VII.—2.

**P**ENTAMETERS. The change of metre and the difference in the contents, perhaps also the 'Selah' at the end of v. 6, combine to show that vv. 7—12 form a unity. It is a prayer for the redress of the wrongs inflicted on Israel by the Edomites. Halévy finds a 'solution of continuity' between v. 7 and v. 8, which he remedies by moving viii. 3 hither. The supposed remedy, however, is opposed by metrical considerations, and textual criticism can suggest something better for both contexts. Note the disappearance of the late word גִּמְרָה (cf. *OP*, 464; Sellin, *De Orig.*, 102. Note also the exquisite title of Yahwè in l. 8b.

- 1 Arise, O Yahwè! in thine anger, | uplift thyself in thine  
indignation; 7  
Rouse thee, O my God! for my redress, | and awake for  
my right.  
Let the assembly of [the sons of] the Ishmaelites | swear  
by thee; 8  
Let not the Jerahmeelites<sup>1</sup> any more | crush thy people.  
Right me, O Yahwè! according to mine innocence, | ac-  
cording to my ways; 9  
Test my reins and my heart, | thou righteous Judge. 10b  
Let Yahwè be my protector, | +who is+ the succourer of  
the upright in heart, 11  
Yahwè—a righteous Judge, | a refuge from Jerahmeel. 12

3 f. M gives a bad sense. Can it be the assembly of the peoples who are to be judged that is spoken of? Anyhow this requires that witnesses should be introduced as a preliminary to the judgment (cp. l. 4, 6). These witnesses might naturally be the inhabitants of heaven and (so far as they are not implicated in any crime) of earth. More especially those of heaven, who are

above earthly frailties, and yet not to be compared with Yahwè, might seem fit for the purpose (lxxxix. 6-8). *By thee*, i.e. surrounded by them (lxxxix. 8b; cp. Isa. vi. 1) *on the height* of heaven, stands the throne of Yahwè. A bolder course, however, appears more satisfactory (see crit. n.). M's reading is very confusing to exegesis. 'Return thou to the height' can only mean

<sup>1</sup> Jerahmeel, wicked ones (v. 10a)?

'return to heaven.' Such an address would be intelligible if it came at the end of a description of a divine judgment, but is not in place at the beginning. To explain שׁוּבָה, 'resume thy judicial functions' (Kimḥi, *Ilun.*, Bā.) is not permissible. That the received text should be so far from yielding a good sense, is unfortunate, but we can at least see traces of a possible and even probable text.

5. Note the characteristic post-exilic claim to (legal) righteousness; cp. on xvii. 4 f., xlv. 18-23.

6. The *wicked* and the *righteous* are the enemies of the pious community (whether of foreign or native origin) and pious Israel respectively. Cp. ix.

6, lxviii. 3, cxviii. 15, 20. צַדִּיק is a collective. Cp. *OP*, 293 f.; Smend, *Rel.-gesch.* 401.

8. זָעַם The growling of an irritated animal may be the root-idea (cp. Ges. (13)). Cp. Num. xxiii. 7 f., Prov. xxiv. 4, Isa. xxx. 27, Hos. vii. 16, where זָעַם is closely connected with speech.

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. Note Paseḳ after יְהוָה; the context was indistinctly written. M gives בַּעֲבֹרֹת צוּרִי 'at the wrath of my foes'? or 'in the wrath due to my foes'? 'A and most moderns prefer the former view, Θ J T the latter. Parallelism and metre, however, require us to read בַּעֲבֹרֹתָ (so Hal.), taking it with הַפֶּשַׁא, and leaving צוּרִי for the next line; otherwise we might, with Budde (in We., *Skizzen*, vi. 167), read 'בַּעֲבוּר צוּרִי. בַּעֲבוּר צוּרִי has not improbably come out of צַדִּיק [ל]. מִשְׁפַּט צִוִּית, which is as awkward as עֲנִיתִי in xxii. 22, is a combination of words belonging to both parts of the line, viz. לְמִשְׁפַּטִּי and הַקִּיצָה. הַקִּיצָה should be אֱלֹהִי (cp. on xviii. 3). Read—

| וְהַקִּיצָה

3 f. Insert בְּנִי (metre), and for לְאֻמִּים (since nothing indicates that the great judgment-day is meant) read יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים.—M תִּסְבֹּכְךָ. Read תִּשְׁבַּע בְּךָ.—M שׁוּבָה. Rashi, Döderlein, Dathe, Reuss, Smend, Bi., Dy., Gr. &c. read שָׁבָה (cp. ix. 5). This, however, does not remove the difficulties of the text. It is plausible, and agreeable to parallel cases, to take over יָדִין עַמִּים from v. 9, and gently emend it, and to read (omitting יְהוָה as a gloss), נִפְךְ

5 f. M וּבְמַעֲנֵלָתִי. עָלִי is most unnatural. Read וּבְכַתְּמֵי עָלִי. The corruption arose from a scribe's misarrangement of the letters.—As to M's insertion at the head of v. 10, רַע (with Paseḳ after it) is a miswritten fragment of רַשָּׁעִים; יִגְמַר נָא springs from a miswritten יִרְחַמְאֵל. 'Jerahmeel, wicked ones,' is a gloss on 'Jerahmeelites' in l. 4 or 'Jerahmeel' in l. 8.—תְּכוּנָה springs from תּוֹכָן, which is a variant to בָּחוּן in v. 10<sup>b</sup>; צַדִּיק is a repetition. Read probably (cp. xxvi. 2<sup>b</sup>), י

7 f. M מְגַנִּי עַל-אֱלֹהִים. Yahwè, his servants' shield-bearer! עָלִי would improve the sense; but the context throws doubt on the referenc

to a shield. The covenant-name of God is also wanted. Read *עַלֵּי יְהוָה* (Zech. ix. 15). Now we see how the *י* in *עַלֵּי* dropped out.—*מֵאֵל זַעַם* ; *בְּכָל־יּוֹם* ‘a God who is wrathful every day’? is a statement at once vague and alarming—not natural at the end of a psalm or stanza. *אֵל* is a fragment of *יִרְחֵמָאֵל*. The same word, almost in full, appears as *בְּכָל־יּוֹם* (*מָעַז מִיִּרְחֵמָאֵל* and *ב, ה* and *כ* confounded). Read *מָעַז מִיִּרְחֵמָאֵל*.

## PSALM VIII.

**TRIMETERS.** A fine fragment of a poetical cosmogony. The only passage which seems to conflict with this view, and to introduce ideas not perfectly germane to it, is certainly corrupt. The ‘enemy’ spoken of is not any Persian or Syrian king, but the dragon of chaos, in whose destruction all men are as much concerned as Israel. All mankind, then, should sing this song in its various tongues; ‘our Lord’ is certainly not a mere nationalistic phrase. ‘Man is the world’s high priest’ (George Herbert), though, as the psalmists think, he can only rise to the heights of his grand destiny by the aid of Israel (cp. *OP*, 366). Yet the psalm is thoroughly Jewish, and if we had it in its complete form, we should doubtless see this more clearly. Like Ps. civ., it implies the Messianic belief (in the larger sense). The idealism of these poetic cosmogonists has a prophetic significance. The present sadly imperfect creation points to a new and better creation in the future (cp. Heb. ii. 8). The same result follows from the universal lordship of Yahwè (‘our Lord’). To become a fit theatre for the great king’s visible assumption of his crown, nature as well as Israel must be regenerated. What comfort lay in this for an oppressed people, and what stimulus to religious thought!—Parallelisms are pointed out in the notes.

*Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Marked: Of ‘Arab-ethan.* 1

- 1 Our Lord! how glorious is thy name!  
 Thou hast stretched forth the heavens as a tent.  
 In the days of old thou didst array thee with strength<sup>3</sup> 3  
 To still the enemy, the assailant.  
 When I see the work of thy fingers, 4  
 Moon and stars which thou hast fashioned,  
 What is man that thou shouldest think of him, 5  
 Or one of earth’s race that thou shouldest befriend him?  
 Thou madest him scarce less than the divine ones, 6  
 10 With glory and with state didst thou crown him;  
 Thou madest him to rule over the works of thy hands, 7  
 Thou didst place [them] all under his feet.  
 Sheep, and oxen, and camels, \* 8  
 Also the beasts that rove,  
 The birds of the sky, and the fishes 9  
 Which traverse ocean-paths.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Yahwè.<sup>2</sup> In all the earth.<sup>3</sup> Because of thy foes.<sup>4</sup> Yahwè our Lord! how glorious is thy name in all the earth.

1-4. The first stanza in the received text is very incoherent and obscure. In the corrected text the psalmist glorifies Yahwè, Lord of Israel and of all nations, for the wonders of the nightly sky, with a reference (as Duhm, independently of the present writer, has seen) to the destruction of the dragon (see on lxxiv. 14, lxxxix. 11, and 'Dragon,' in *Enc. Brit.*), which was followed, according to the traditional creation story, by the production of heaven:—'He smote her as a . . . | into two parts; || one half he took, | he made it heaven's arch.' Compare l. 3 with Isa. li. 9. Another parallelism between l. 4 and xliv. 17, which has led Merx (in the Chwolson *Festschrift*) to make the Psalm Maccabæan, will not bear a close examination, text and date of xliv. 17 being in dispute.

1. **Our Lord.** A synonym for Yahwè in Neh. viii. 10, x. 30, Psalm cxxxv. 5, cxlvii. 5.—**אֲדִיר**; cp. on xciii. 4.—*Thy name*, i.e. thy manifestation of thyself (see on liv. 3); or, thy monument (Isa. lv. 13). The poet suggests a connexion between **שֵׁם** and **שָׁמַיִם**.

5. **Thy fingers.** The old mythologic habit of mind revived in these later poets (cp. l. 12, xix. 2, cii. 26).

7 f. Cp. cxliv. 3, but *not* Job vii. 17 f., which is no 'despairing parody' of a psalm, and **וּתְפַקְדְּנוּ** in Job being incorrect (see on xvii. 3). Notice that the human species is first mentioned;

then the individual man. So in Gen. i. 26 the creation of man as a race is first spoken of; then that of the first human pair. **תְּפַקְדְּנוּ**; cp. **פָּקַדָה**.

Job x. 12, of divine providence.

9. **מַעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים.** Our learned Milton renders, 'scarce to be less than gods'; cp. Gen. i. 27, **בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים** 'in the image of gods.' Ewald (at first), 'little less than God' (so Hi., De., Bā., after A 30); but as God to our psalmist is Yahwè, and is the Being addressed, this is unsuitable. Ewald's later rendering (*Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, iii. 6, 100, n. 2) was 'than (high) angels' (cp. G.), which paraphrases too much. To the Hebrew consciousness there was no unseemliness in calling the heavenly beings **בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים** (see on Job ii. 1) or **אֱלֹהִים** (see lxxxii. 1 ?), not merely because they were the 'interpreters and executors of the divine will' (Ew.), but because Yahwè and those who composed his court belonged to the same class of superhuman beings (*elōhîm*). G's rendering *παρ' ἀγγέλους* is but an evidence of the angelological tendency of the later Jews (cp. G, xcvi. 7, cxxxviii. 1, Isa. ix. 5, Job xx. 15).

10. **Glory and state, כְּבוֹד וְדָדָר**, are special attributes of Yahwè (xxix. 1, 4, civ. 1, cxlv. 5).

13. **And camels.** Cp. Gen. xii. 16, Ex. ix. 3, 1 Chron. xii. 40.

*Critical notes.* 1. Omit **יְהוָה** and **בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ** (amplifying glosses).

2. M **אֲשֶׁר־תִּנְהַ חוֹדֶד עַל־הַש'**. **אשר**, as often, was put in by an editor to patch up a connexion. **תִּנְה** is plainly corrupt. Ingenuity is of no avail; **נָתַן** is not the right verb, and the root **תִּנְה** 'to celebrate,' is not secure. G's *ἐπιπῆθη* suggests **נִעְלָה** (cp. xlvii. 9), but looks too much like a guess. Buhl (Ges. *HWB* <sup>(13)</sup>) suggests **נָטָה**. The writer proposes, **נָטָה כְּאֶחָל הַש'** (cp. Isa. xl. 22). This suits the context, and the faults presupposed in MT are agreeable to analogy. **עַל־** before **הַש'** in MT is due to a dittographed **הַל** (perhaps a fragment of a correction).

3 f. For Hal.'s view of v. 3 see on vii. 8.—M **מִפִּי עוֹלָלִים | וַיִּוְנְקִים** **עוֹ** **יִסְדָּתָ עוֹ** (note Pasek). The first difficulty in M arises out of the preposition; 'to found out of' is not a regular idiom, nor is it any gain to read

with Merx, יִסְרַת עֹז, 'thou hast chastised obstinacy' (cp. Dan. viii. 23). The next is the want of a natural connexion both between l. 3 and l. 4, and between both lines and the context. Apart from this, 'infants and sucklings' might no doubt be a figurative expression for humble-minded Jewish believers (cp. cxxxi. 2, M; see note in 1st ed., and *Aids to Criticism*, 234). Read probably בִּימֵי עוֹלָם לְבַשְׁתָּ עֹז (an allusion to Isa. li. 9). Omit וּמִתְנַקֵּם as a miswritten וּמִתְנַקֵּם (ditto-graphed), and לִמְעַן צוֹרֵרִיד as a gloss.—M וּמִתְנַקֵּם. But surely vindictiveness is not a sin to a Semite. Read וּמִתְקוֹלָם (xvii. 7, lix. 2, Job xxvii. 7, &c.), with Nestle (*Marginalien*, 34, not mentioned by Duhm). Nah. i. 9 (G) shows how easily קוֹם and נָקַם could be confounded. Cp. Cornill on Ezek. xxv. 12–14. See on xlix. 17.

5. M inserts שְׂמִיךְ, a corruption of מַעֲשִׂיךְ (written in error and left). G corrects into שְׂמִים. Smend reads שְׂמֵשׁ, but metre opposes.

12 f. M כָּל. Read כָּלָם (Bi.<sup>2</sup>). See next note.—M צָנָה וְאַלְפִים כָּלָם. The form צָנָה is improbable, and כָּלָם is weak. Read צֹאן וְאַלְפִים כָּלָם. (Herz אֲלֵפֵי מִכְלָה 'domestic cattle.')

15 f. M וְדָגִים הָיָם עֲבָר. וְדָגִים is too isolated. Read וְדָגִים הָעֲבָרִים; G τὰ διαπορευόμενα.—The repetition of *v.* 1 at the end is to make up for the lost second part of the psalm.

## PSALMS IX. AND X.

PARTLY trimeters, partly tetrameters, indicating either the imperfect skill of the psalmist in the management of his metre, or the interference of a second writer with the original poem. The second hypothesis is the more probable. Originally the poem was, no doubt, a perfect alphabetical psalm, at least so far as relates to the consistency of the metre and the number of stanzas. A later writer however, broke it into two parts, which became independent psalms through the insertion of what now forms ix. 20 f. (notice 'Selah,' = 'for supplementing,' after *v.* 21). Possibly an earlier and more gifted editor allowed himself still greater freedom, altering and partly rewriting certain stanzas. The only fairly well connected portion of the original psalm which we can with probability point to is *v.* 2–13 (*ll.* 1–24). Here there is complete unity of situation and probably consistency of metre (trimeters). The pious community sings praise to Yahwè for his overthrow of Israel's enemies, and calls upon its several members to make known his exploits. The ד stanza, it is true, has perished; we may venture, however, to assume that it only gave a further development to the ideas of the נ stanza, for there seems to be a designed contrast between אָבַד in l. 12 and

לְעוֹלָם in l. 13. The ט stanza presupposes the same situation as the stanzas א to י. But it consists of tetrameters, and is preceded by another stanza (ח) also in tetrameters, which implies that the speaker cannot at present sing Yahwè's praises because he has sunk down to the gates of Deathland, and can only cry for pity. The י stanza (tetrameters) predicts a reversal of the fates of the wicked and the suffering righteous respectively. The ל stanza, which (according to the present restoration of the text precedes the נ stanza) begins with a

complaint of Yahwè's inactivity, and passes into a description of the conduct of the wicked ; both this and the **ב** stanza consist of tetrameters. The stanzas **ב** to **ז** (**ב** and **ד** are wanting) continue the description of the wicked, who in *ll.* 53, 55, 59 appear as the Jerahmeelites or Arabians.

At first we have chiefly tetrameters ; then trimeters (*ll.* 51—58). The **ק**, **ר**, and **ת** stanzas consist of tetrameters ; the speaker pleads with Yahwè to interpose for the pious. The **ש** stanza however, consists of trimeters. It opens with a prayer to Yahwè to break the power of the tyrant, and concludes with an anticipative exclamation on Yahwè's assumption of his royalty and the destruction of the wicked.

It would seem, then, that two or three hands have been concerned in producing the present Ps. ix.—x. We must not, however, exaggerate the inconsistencies of the psalm. Critics seem to have done this through not having recognized that **גוֹיִם** in ix. 6, 16, 18, 20 f., x. 16 is corrupt. The same enemies are spoken of throughout ; they are rich men, and nominal believers in God ; we cannot venture to say that they are exclusively Jews, but Jews are certainly prominent among them (see on *l.* 33). And though the tone of the stanzas **ל** to **ת** is on the whole much more subdued than that of the stanzas **א** to **י**, yet the **ת** stanza is certainly as depressed in tone as any of the later stanzas, and the second part of the **ש** stanza is as idealistic as any of the earlier stanzas. There is indeed no absolute inconsistency between the triumphant and the complaining parts of the psalm. The triumphant parts simply bear witness to the strength of Jewish faith. The perfects in the Hebrew are either 'prophetic' or, as perhaps **אֲכַרֵּךְ** in *l.* 72, 'precativè.' The destruction of the enemies of Israel is really still future ; it will not become a fact before the Messianic age. Faith regards the advent of Yahwè as so sure that it can truthfully speak of it as past. Still, the sufferings of true Israelites are great, and almost crushing ; the tone of triumph may therefore quite naturally give place after a time to that of longing. The psalm may indeed be composite, but the writer who (putting aside corruptions) brought it into its present form, was probably not conscious of producing inconsistencies thereby. Note the points of contact in ix. 18, x. 6, with *l.* 22, xviii. 37. These and similar phenomena (see notes) make an early date impossible. The enemies are the Jerahmeelites or Arabians, and the psalm is presumably, like so many of the parallel psalms, of the late Persian period. The judgment referred to is of course the Messianic. The extirpation of the Arabian invaders and oppressors was a necessary feature of it (cp. Joel iii. [iv.]). Other views, such as Halévy's (*REF*, janv.—mars, 1891 ; last years of Exile) and Beer's (p. lxxii. ; after fall of Persian empire), have an insufficient basis, and imply that **גוֹיִם** is correct. On the critical difficulties of the psalm cp. Bickell (*Carm. V. T. metrice*, 1882, pp. 4-6) ; T. K. Abbott (*Hermathena*, 1899, 21 ff.) ; Grimme (*ZDMG*, l., 569 ff.) ; Rosenthal (*ZATW*, 1896, p. 40) ; Staerk (*St. u. Kr.*, 1897, 468 ff.).

*Deposited. Of the sons of Salmah. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | <b>א</b> Heartily do I thank thee, O Yahwè,       | 2 |
|   | I will tell out all thy wonders ;                 |   |
|   | I will rejoice and triumph because of thee,       | 3 |
|   | I will chant hymns to thy name for ever.          |   |
|   | •   |   |
|   | <b>ב</b> Because mine enemies, turning to flee,   | 4 |
|   | Have stumbled and perished at thine +angry+ coun- |   |
|   | tenance ;   |   |
|   | Yea, thou hast established my right and my claim, | 5 |
|   | Thou hast sat on the tribunal of justice.         |   |

- 2 Thou hast quelled the traitors, and hast destroyed them, 6  
 10 The wicked thou hast wiped out for ever ;  
 Their castles are deserted for aye, 7  
 They have disappeared, their name has vanished.<sup>1</sup>
- 7 He himself will abide for ever ; 8  
 He has set up his throne for judgment :  
 The world he will judge with righteousness, 9  
 To the peoples he will give sentence with justice,
- 1 So that for the crushed he is a sure retreat, 10  
 Proved as a helper in trouble ;
- So that those that know thy name trust in thee, 11  
 20 For those that seek thee, O Yahwè, thou forsakest  
 not.
- 1 Chant hymns to the +king+ enthroned in Zion, 12  
 Declare his exploits among the peoples,—  
 For the distress of the orphans he remembers, 13  
 He forgets not the cry of the sufferers.
- 7 Pity me, O Yahwè ; behold my suffering ; 14  
 From the gates of Deathland mayest thou lift me up ;  
 That I may recount all thy famous deeds, 15  
 That in the gates of Zion's people I may triumph at thy  
 succour.
- 20 The traitors are sunk in the pit which they made, 16  
 30 In the net which they hid their own feet have been  
 caught.  
 Yahwè makes himself known ; he has established the  
 right, 17  
 In his own hands' work the wicked has been snared.
- The wicked will turn to flee and will stumble— 18  
 All the traitors that deny God.  
 For not alway will the needy be forgotten, 19  
 The sufferers' hope will not be lost for ever.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The 7 stanza is wanting.

<sup>2</sup> Arise, O Yahwè, let not him that hates me triumph ; 20  
 Let the traitors be judged before thee.  
 Set a watch over them. O Yahwè ;  
 Let the traitors learn that they are but men. 21  
*Supplement.*



- 30      ♪ Why standest thou afar off, O Yahwè, x. 1  
         Hiding thine eyes at the cry of thy servant ?  
         In his pride the wicked crushes the sufferer ; 2  
 40      Let them be caught +themselves+ in the plots they  
         have devised !
- ♫ For the wicked boasts of his gratified desire, 3  
         Triumphing in his glory he blasphemes Yahwè :  
         [He has said in his heart,] ' God does not examine,' 4  
         All his designs are only for doing evil. •
- ♫ Fierce are his purposes to defy thee, 5  
         His course he makes to prosper by insults :  
         He has said in his heart, ' I cannot be shaken ; 6  
         Mine ancles will not fail.'<sup>1</sup>
- ♫ His mouth is full of +words of+ trickery ; 7  
 50      +Stored+ under his tongue are +words of+ mischief and  
         trouble :  
         In the wilderness he destroys the righteous, 8  
         On the highways he slays the innocent.
- ♫ Jerahmeel watches the sufferer,  
         As a lion in the thicket he lurks ; 9  
         The Arabian catches the sufferer,  
         And the crushed one falls into his toils. 10
- Jerahmeel says, ' God has forgotten ; 10 (end), 11  
 60      He has hidden his face ; he cannot see it.'<sup>2</sup>
- ♫ Arise, O Yahwè ! neglect not the crushed one, 12  
         Forget not [the sighing] of the sufferers !  
         Why does the wicked blaspheme Yahwè ? 13  
         +Why+ says he in his heart, ' Thou dost not examine ' ?
- ♫ Thou hast seen misery and vexation, 14  
         Thou hast heard the desire of the crushed one,  
         [When] Jerahmeel terrifies the orphan,  
         Thou provest thyself his helper.

<sup>1</sup> The ♫ and ♫ stanzas are wanting.<sup>2</sup> For ever.

- ש Break thou the arm of the terrible, 15  
 70 Examine the injustice of the oppressors.  
     Yahwè is king for ever and ever ; 16  
     The traitors have perished from his land.  
 ת The desire of the sufferers thou hearest, O Yahwè, 17  
     To the musing of their heart thine ear is attentive !  
     [Awake] to right the orphan and the crushed ! 18  
     Let not the blasphemer still continue to triumph !

9. **The traitors**, i. e. 'apostates,' בְּנֵי־בְּנֵי. So in *Ps.* 18, 21, x. 16, and, in *M.* xxv. 3, lix. 6, cxix. 158 ; cp. *Jer.* xii. 1, *Prov.* ii. 22 &c. A regular parallel to רִשְׁעִים. The term applies primarily to Jews, but in a large sense also to non-Jews, Yahwè being *de jure* king of all nations. Cp. on *Isa.* xxiv. 5.—11. *Their castles*. The poet might conceivably mean those of Babylon or of Susa ; but, having the key in our hands, we cannot doubt that he means one of the capitals of the Arabian peoples, i. e. the Jerahmeelites, Mišrites, Edomites. Cp. xlix. 12, lxix. 26, and note reference to the 'castles' of Mišsur (מִצְר) instead of צָר and Edom in *Ain.* i. 10, 12, and to the 'castle (or citadel) of foreigners' in *Isa.* xxv. 2, where the context (*Ps.* 10, reading מִצְר for מוֹאב) shows that the city which has been destroyed is the capital of Mišrim.—13–16. Cp. cii. 26 f., vii. 8, xcvi. 13, xcvi. 9.

22 ff. Cp. xcvi. 3, 10, cv. 1, *Isa.* xii. 4.—*The orphans*, i. e. the Jews. Cp. x. 14, 18, lxxviii. 6, xciv. 6, cxlvi. 9.—*The sufferers*, עֲנִיִּים (כְּרִ. עֲנִיִּים). A standing term, not for the Levites (as Gr. strangely supposes), but for those strict servants of Yahwè who considered themselves to represent the true Israel, and who felt the consequences of Israel's subjection to foreigners more acutely than their neighbours. Hence they are sometimes distinguished from the mass of Israelites. Between עֲנִיִּים and עָנִי

there is no clearly marked difference in usage ; Kt. and Kr. sometimes vary (as here, and in ver. 19, x. 12). The former, however, ought properly to mean 'one who is bowed down,' the latter, 'one who bows down.' The word 'sufferer' does for both words according to English literary usage.<sup>1</sup> Cp. Rahlfs, עֲנִי and עָנִי in *den Psalmen* ('92) ; Cheyne, *Jew. Rel. Life*, 115–124 ; Ryle and James, *Psalms of the Pharisees*, index, s.v. πτωχός.

26. **The gates of Deathland** (i. e. of Sheol, vi. 6). So cvii. 18 ; *Isa.* xxxviii. 10. The Assyrian city of Death had seven walls and gates (cp. *Mt.* xvi. 18).

29 f. **Pit, net**, figures for well-devised plots (cp. vii. 16, x. 9, xxv. 15, xxxv. 7 f., lvii. 7). The great plot of the enemies of the Jewish people and religion is that described in lxxxiii. 5. The retribution would be destruction by divine judgment (cp. *Jer.* i. 24, *Ezek.* xii. 13, xvii. 20). Cp. Ašurbanipal's phraseology (*KB*, ii. 190 f.), 'the net of the great gods, my lords, from which there is no escape.'

33 M has, 'the wicked shall return to Sheol,' i. e. to a state of nothingness ; or, as most, 'shall depart to Sheol.' In the latter case, *Job* xxx. 23 is compared. But both places need to be corrected. In *Job*, Duhm corrects תְּשִׁיבִי (from יָשָׁב). The psalmist, too, must have used a much more impassioned language. See crit. note.—*That deny God* ; same phrase in xlix. 14, l. 23

<sup>1</sup> . . . . . The best of men  
 That e'er wore earth about Him was a sufferer,  
 A soft, meek, patient, humble, tranquil spirit.

To blaspheme God (x. 3 f.) = to deny Him. It is most natural to suppose that here, as in l. 23, the offenders spoken of are of Jewish birth. The two passages which might be quoted in favour of a reference to the heathen (xxii. 28, xciv. 10) are both certainly corrupt.

*Insertion* (vv. 20. 21). *Set a watch*. The traitors are to be confined, like the mythical dragon (Job vii. 12).

39. **The wicked**, a collective term (see l. 40). Lines 41 ff. give an ideal type of the wicked man which reminds us of Ps. lii. Deceit, violence, boastfulness characterize him.

42 ff. **Glory**, i.e. riches (xliv. 17 f.).—*Blasphemes Yahwè*, viz. as a god who either cannot or will not protect his servants.—*Does not examine*, with a view to requiring satisfaction; cp. ll.

64, 70. בַּל for לֹא; for other instances, see Kön., *Styl.* 279 (l. 29).

45 f. He disbelieves in God's judicial activity because no signs of it are within his horizon. Cp. Job xxiii. 13 f., xxiv. 1. He appears to prosper by the *insults* which he lavishes on Yahwè and his servants.

48. From xviii. 37. The improbable expression, 'To all generations I shall not be in adversity' (R V), disappears; see crit. n.

51. The senseless reference to the 'villages' disappears; see crit. n.—54. Cp. xvii. 12.

70. **Examine into**, i.e. punish; see on l. 43. Street, 'punish the impious' (תַּדְרוֹשׁ רָשָׁע וּבָל). See crit.

n.—72. *Have perished*, or 'shall perish' (perf. prec., see Kön., *Synt.* 72; cp. introd.).—*His land*. Not as if limiting the divine sovereignty. Yahwè is the judge of the world (ix. 9), and yet his throne is in Zion, and Israel is 'his own possession' (cxxxv. 4). So 'my land,' Joel iii. 2. No one polluted by 'wickedness,' and animated by that fierce hatred to Israel and its Law which possesses idolaters, can in the future exist there (Nah. i. 15; Isa. lii. 1). A psalmist (civ. 35) goes beyond this, and longs for a time when the whole earth shall cease to be marred by the presence of the 'wicked.'

*Critical Notes.* 1. Read אֹדֶךָ (G, Bi.).—4. מַעֲלִיךָ. Read :  
Cp. on vii. 18.

8. Omit שׁוּפֹט, a corruption of a dittographed יִשְׁבֹּת. So metre is restored.

9 f. M נֹיִם. Read בְּנִדִּים. Same confusion in ll. 29, 34, 72, lix. 6, &c.—M אֲבֹדֶת רָשָׁע שָׁמָּה. To restore symmetry, read אֲבֹדֶתָם (end of l. 9), and continue רָשָׁעִים מִחַיֵּת לְעוֹלָם. שָׁמָּה is produced by dittography.

11. M נַעֲזֹבוּ אֲרָמְנוֹתֶיהֶם. וְעַד: הָאוֹיֵב | תָּמוּ חֲרָבוֹת. perhaps becomes חֲרָבוֹת again in Job iii. 14<sup>b</sup> (Ol.). Note Pasek.

12. M presents אֲרָמְנוֹתֶיהֶם again under the disguise of עֲרִים נָתַתָּ  
Omitting this, read נִשְׁבְּתוּ אֲבֹד זָכָרָם. On G and T, cp. Dr. J. Taylor, *Exp. T.*, v. 131.

13, 15. M's וַיְהִי seems to be an expansion of הוּא, which word replace from ver. 9a. In l. 15 read וַיִּשְׁפֹּט.

17 f. M דָּךְ; so x. 18, lxxiv. 21. Read נִדְכָּה. See on l. 53. G here τῶ πενήτη, but elsewhere ταπεινῶ, τεταπεινωμένος.—M מִשְׁנֵב לְעֵתוֹת בְּצָרָה. The repetition of 'מִשְׁ' is improbable; experience leads one to doubt whether the same word was repeated in the second line of a distich as

23. M **אוֹתָם** **כִּי־דִרְשׁ** **דְּמִים** **אוֹתָם** **זָכָר** is obviously wrong ; some one has proposed **יִתּוֹם**. Parallelism requires **כִּי־יִשְׁבֵּר** **יִתּוֹמִים** **זָכָר**.

32. Point נִקֵּשׁ with G S 'A T J, Ew., Ol., Bö., Bā., We., Du. See xxxviii. 13.—M appends הַנִּינּוּ סֵלָה. But see on *l.* 74.

*Insertion after l. 36.* מֵאֶל־עֵזֹ אֲנֹשׁ. Read אֶל־עֵזֹ שׁוֹנֵאִי (see lii. 9, and cf. l. 76 and xciv. 3).—מִזְרָה may be either מזרָה or מזְרָה.

38 f. M תַּעֲלִים לַעֲתוֹת בְּצִרָה. Cf. on l. 8. Read ים [עיניך]

41. M דהלל. Read יתהלל (Gr.); cf. cvi. 5. G ἐπαινεῖται.

<sup>1</sup> See Geiger, *l.c.*; Beer, *Text des B. Hiob*, 3.

43 f. M בְּנִאוֹתָו. An unparalleled phrase. Read certainly בְּנִאוֹתָו. 'רָשַׁע בִּג' is a marginal correction of בְּנִאוֹת רָשַׁע in *l.* 39, which has intruded into the text at this point and supplanted בָּלְבוֹ (cf. *l.* 64). —M אֵין אֱלֹהִים, which is attached to כָּל מ', The construction is most improbable. אֱלֹהִים, it seems to me, does double duty. It is (1) the object of יִדְרֵשׁ, from which it is now wrongly separated, and (2) it represents quite another word, which it somewhat resembles, and has supplanted. Read אֵין בְּלִי־דֶרֶשׁ אֱלֹהִים אֵף לְהִרְעֵ כָּל מ' (and אֵף were easily confounded). G, however, followed by Abbott, attaches 'נָאֵץ to *v.* 4.

45 f. M מִרוֹם מִשְׁפָּטִיךְ מִנְגִּדוֹ. Gr.'s מִרוֹם and Grimme's מִרִּים (suggested by G's ἀνταναρπείται, and the ἤρται of another vers.) are insufficient (Abbott סָרוּ). Analogy may here be an imperfect guide; what it suggests is מִרוֹ מִחֲשַׁבְתִּיו לִנְגִּדוֹ.—Line 2 (misplaced) appears in two forms in M: כָּל־צוּרֵרְיוֹ יִפִּיחַ בָּהֶם and יַחֲלִילוֹ דְּרָכּוֹ בְּכָל־עֵת. In the latter, יַחֲלִילוֹ = יַצְלִיחַ, and this is the true original of יַחֲלִילוֹ (cp. T's מִצְלָחִין for (יַחֲלִילוֹ), as We., and virtually Lag., Gr., Merx, Sievers hold. Cp. xxxvii. 7. [Hal. reads יַשְׁכִּילוֹ רֵרִיו] רֵרִיו is a fragment of דְּרָכּוֹ בָּהֶם. יַפִּיחַ בָּהֶם seems to be a corruption of בְּחַרְפּוֹת; בְּכָל־עֵת, of בְּכָל־מָת. We can choose between these two readings. The result is [בַּח] יַצְלִיחַ דְּרָכּוֹ בְּכָל־מָת. The difficulties of the interpreters sufficiently prove the extreme doubtfulness of M's text. It is needless to recount these. Ley points out the metrical improbability of the weak בָּהֶם at the end of the line (*Leitfaden*, 36). Cp. ii. 3; xix. 5 is no evidence to the contrary.

48. Read וְלֹא יִמְעָדוּ קִרְסָלִי (cp. xviii. 37<sup>b</sup>, xxx. 8 corr. text). Out of לְדוֹר וְדוֹר קִרְסָלִי written twice over has produced אֲשֶׁר לֹא בָרַע אֱלֹהִים. This seems to be the whole secret of the troublesome passage. Gr.'s אֲשֶׁר־י was a step in the right direction.

49. M's אֱלֹהִים (with Paseḡ) is accounted for above.—Read מִרְמוֹת and omit וְתָךְ; תָּךְ is a dittogram of תַּח.

51 f. M יֵשֵׁב בְּמִאֲרָב חֲצִירִים. Every single word is strange. Lag. (*Agathangelus*) and independently Herz suggest רִצְחִים. The former corrects G thus, ἐγκάθεται ἐνεδρεύματι πλυσίῳ (רַחֲצִים). But 'in a lurking-place of murderers' is very odd, and אֲרָב is superabundantly represented. Read probably יֵשֵׁד בְּמִדְבָּר צִדִּיקִים (cp. Jer. iii. 2).—For מִמִּסְתָּרִים read בְּמִסְלֹת. It now becomes needless to read לְהִרְגֵּן (G 2 J, Gr., Bā.).

53. Here we first meet with the strange word חֲלִיקָה, pointed as if 'thy host'; in *v.* 14 (*l.* 67), חֲלִיקָה in pause (!); in *v.* 10 (*l.* 59) plur. חֲלִיקָאִים, but Kr. חֲלִ פָּאִים, i.e. 'a host of downcast ones' (נִכְאָאִים). Since Schultens (*Opera minora*, 182 f.), most have assumed a word חֲלִיקָה

(Ew.) or חֶלְכָה (Kön. ii. 1, 118), 'dark,' 'unfortunate'; see *BDB*. One might also suppose חֶלְכָה; cp. חֶלְכָּלִי and Ass. *akkulu*, 'troubled' (root-idea, darkness), *ikkillu*, 'lamentation.' As if the psalmist had not words enough for 'miserable' without hunting up a very obscure one, not to be found even in Job! 'A strange and as yet unexplained word,' says Wellh. But we have the key to it, knowing who were the chief oppressors of the Jews in Palestine after the fall of the Jewish state. Read יִרְחֶמָאֵל; cp. the error in v. 5 (*l.* 4). G guesses, εἰς τὸν πένητα (here); τῶν πένητων (*v.* 10); ὁ πτωχός (*v.* 14), as if אֲבוֹנוֹ, דְּלִים, דָּל. This involves reading עֵינִי יִצְפֹּנָה. In fact, M's phrase עֵינִי יִצְפֹּנָה is very questionable. Most justify it by Prov. i. 11, 18, but צֹפֵן there means 'to lie in wait,' which is unsuitable here. Hence Ol., Gr., Hal., Herz suppose the root צִפָּה 'to watch' (cp. I E *ad loc.*), reading יִצְפִּיּוֹן, or the like; cp. xxxvii. 32. G ἀποβλέπουσι. Most probably we should read יִצְפֹּנָה יִרְחֶמָאֵל. The corruption of 'יר into a supposed adjective חֶלְכָה involved the misreadings עֵינִי and יִצְפִּיּוֹ (of which יִצְפֹּנָה is a corruption).

54. M בִּסְכָּה; J, Ol., Bā. בִּסְכָּה. Read בִּסְכָּבָה (Lag., We., Ginsb.); cp. Jer. iv. 7. G in both passages μάνδρα. במסתר (with Pasek) is dittographic.

55. לחטוף. ירחמאל, עֲרָבִי, repeated, is hardly right. Read עֲרָבִי עֲרָבִי is dittographic.

56. Dittography again. מִרְשָׁתוֹ and בִּמְשָׁכוֹ (where ר is an imperfect *q*) both come from בְּמִקְשָׁתוֹ. בְּעִצּוּמִים (עִצּוּמִים, a dual, = claws, Ew. Ol.!) seems to be a corruption of the other plur. form בְּמִקְשָׁיו, and יִשָּׁה a corrupt fragment of this word. Next we have to explain Kt. וְדָכָה or וְדָכָה; Σ ὁ δὲ θλασθεῖς; J *et confractum* (so 'A S). Kx., however (and some MSS. and edd.) יִדְכָּה. G ταπεινώσει αὐτόν; T יִדְכָּהּ = יִדְכָּהּ (in fact, דָּכָה in Kx. is not used). Presuming this to be *l.* 1 of the צ stanza, Grimme would read צִדִּיק נִדְכָּה (Abbott יִדְכָּה 'צ). But dittography and corruption have to be allowed for. Accepting Grimme's נִדְכָּה let us read, as *l.* 56, וּבְמִקְשָׁתוֹ נִדְכָּה נָפַל.

59 (Lines 57 f. are lost). That the original of יִרְחֶמָאֵל חֶלְכָּאִים is sufficiently clear (compare כ and מ in various forms of writing). Omit בָּלָבוּ, perhaps an editorial adjustment of a dittographed fragment of יִרְחֶמָאֵל, of which כָּלָב (Caleb) may be also a corruption.

61 f. M אֵל נִשָּׂא יָדָהּ; but some MSS. and edd. יָדִיד. אֵל directly after יהוה? נִשָּׂא (see on iv. 7)? Read, almost as v. Ortenberg (*Textkritik*, i ff.), אֵל-תִּשָּׂא נִדְכָּה; cp. Di. and Dr. on Dt. xxxii. 18 (תָּשִׂי). Insert אֲנַחַת (metre). Cp. *l.* 65.

63. Read יִנְאָץ (note Pasek).

65—69. Note the three Paseks. Lines 65 f. have been mixed up. *תביט לתת בידך* (verss. *כי אתה* [ש]מַעֲתָה). For *לתת בידך* (verss. *ביריד*), we should read *לתַאֲבֵת נדבה* (שמַעֲתָה). *לתת* must be taken together, as = *לתאבת*, a correction of *תביט* = *תאבת*. 'To lay (it) in thy hand' (M) is very odd. Duthe compares Isa. xlix. 16!

67 f. M *עלִיד יַעֲזֹב חִלְכָּהּ*, by an ellipsis of *דָּבָרוּ* 'his cause' (Ol.). But there is corruption. *חלכה* and *עלִיד* represent a dittographed *ירחמאל יתום*. *יתום* is metrically superfluous in L. 68. Read therefore *אֲתָהּ הָיִיתָ אֲזָרוּ*, and continue, *בִּי יַעֲרֹץ ירחמאל יתום* (*אָזָרוּ* with We., Du.).

69—72. For *רָשַׁע* read *עָרִיץ*. Omit *ורע* (from dittographed *זרוע*?). For *רָשַׁעוּ בלֹת־מִצָּא* read *עוֹל חֲמָצִים*. *רש* is simply dittographed. Gr., Du. follow G, pointing M's verbs as passives; We. reads *אֶל־תִּשָּׂא*. But no doubt seems to be possible. For *גִּוִּים* read *בְּנֵדִים* (see on L. 9).

74. M *תִּכְנִין לָבֶם*; vague, and against parallelism. Hi., We., Du., *לִבְךָ*, i.e. 'thou settest thy mind to judge,' &c. But is this natural? G rightly sees that *תִּכְנִין* must represent a noun, but *ἐτοιμασίαν* (*תְּכִינִית*) does not help us. Read *הַגִּיּוֹן* (xix. 15). Strangely enough, the marginal correction *הַגִּיּוֹן לָבֶם* passed into the text at a most unsuitable point, and became *הַגִּיּוֹן סֵלָה* (ix. 17 : cp. on L. 32).

75 f. Prefix *עוֹרָה* (Bi.), and for *דָּךְ* read *נִדְבָה* (L. 17). For *לַעֲרֹץ* read *מִנְאֵץ* (cp. on lii. 9), and for *מִן־הָאֲרָץ* read *מִנְאֵץ* (cp. L. 13, xv. 4). Omit *אֲנוֹשׁ*, a corruption of *מִנְאֵץ*. *מִן־הָאֲרָץ* springs out of a correction of

## PSALM XI.

**T**ETRAMETERS (double dimeters). Textual criticism throws a bright light on the meaning of the Psalm. The immediate occasion is the ravages of the Jerahmeelites. But the psalmist sees in these only a specimen of the perpetual strife between the evil, who have power in their hands, and the good, who are defenceless. The weak-minded among the good ask, What reward has the righteous (L. 6)? The psalmist meets the anxious question by pointing to the divine omniscience and the certainty of the Messianic judgment. Soon the Arabian intruders will be expelled, and the upright people will see God's face in a land entirely their own. The opening words coincide with those of Ps. vii., which, as the title probably says, has reference to hostile Jerahmeelites. The two psalms (i.e. vii.<sup>(1)</sup> and xi.) may with much profit be closely compared; e.g. the description in L. 3—5 is parallel to that in vii. 13f. The discouraging words in L. 2 may remind us of iii. 3 and iv. 7; cp. *לִנְפֹשׁ*, xi. 1, iii. 3. The parallelism however, is perhaps imperfect; the speakers here may conceivably be despondent Jews. But the same spirit of indomitable trust which pervades Pss. iii. and iv. is plainly visible in Ps. xi. Ps. lxiv. is also parallel; we find there the same representation of the Arabians as the leaders of the band of wicked and deceitful

men—a band which by no means exclusively consists of non-Jewish members, the same figure of the arrows, and the same confident assurance of a coming retribution for the wicked. Notice in Ps. lxiv. the same designation of the righteous as **יְשָׁרִי לֵב**. Cp. also Ps. cxl. **בְּנֵי־אֱלֹהִים**, as xii. 2, xiv. 2.

That the speaker is the pious community, can hardly be disputed (see Hengstenberg, and cp. Coblenz, 97 ff.). Smend indeed, following Olshausen, supposes a leader of Israel to be meant (*Rel.-gesch.*<sup>(2)</sup> 382, 457), but as in the case of Pss. iii., iv., lxii., this is quite unnecessary, and leads to inconsistencies in exegesis.

*Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.*

I

1 In Yahwè I take refuge ; | how can ye say to me,  
'Dread Jerahmeel | and the folk of the Arabians.

For behold the Arabians | bend the bow, 2

Those of Jerahmeel | aim the shaft,

To shoot in a place of ambush | at the upright in heart. 3

When the wicked work ruin, | what reward has the  
righteous ?

Yahwè is in his holy palace, | Yahwè's throne is in heaven ; 4

His eyes keep watch, | they view the race of Edom.

Yahwè loves the righteous, | but the wicked he hates. 5

10 The Ishmaelites will give way, | the Maacathites, the  
Rehobothites ; 6

A horrible blast | is the portion of Cusham.

For Yahwè is righteous ; | righteous dealing he loves ; 7

The upright will behold | his face for ever.

2. **Jerahmeel, Arabia.** Cp. xlv. 2, l. 15, lxxiv., l. 8.—5. *In a hiding place.* Cp. lxiv. 5.

6. **What reward, &c.** This strikes the keynote (see *Intro.*). Cp. lxxiii., cxvi.

7 ff. Cp. Ps. xiv.—10. The savage imprecation in M's text gives way to criticism. Cp. cxlii., on which 7. 12 is a commentary. The dream of pious

Israelites is the Holy Land for the Jews only.—11. *A blast of horror.* A simoom may be thus described.

13. **Will behold his face.** AV's rendering, 'His countenance doth behold the upright,' though the Vss. (except J) support it, is against usage ; see also cxl. 14. The speaker's view of the future is Messianic in the larger sense (see on xvi. 11).

*Critical Notes.* 2. Most moderns prefer the נִדְרֵי of Kt. The Vss., however, prefer הִרְכָּם. They also favour צִפּוֹר [כְּמִן] צִפּוֹר, whereas M has הִרְכָּם צִ. 'Like a bird' (cxxiv. 7) is an obvious but a very poor correction. Israel's dispiriting advisers would not have said 'flee like a bird.' הִרְכָּם and הִרְכָּם are not less unsatisfactory. מִצְרָחוֹק (Isa. xxii. 36) would be possible in lieu of הִרְכָּם. But we want some definite colouring, and knowing that רָקַם is a common disguise of יִרְהוּמָאֵל, and that 'Jerahmeel' appears again and again in these psalms, we may safely



correct **הָרַכְם** into **מִירְחַמָּאֵל**, combining with this **נִדְרִי** for **נִדְרֵי**, and **מֵעַם עֲרָבִים** for **צָפֹר** (from **עֲרָבִי**). Cp. iii. 7. [Wellh., *Skizzen*, vi. 168, defends M's text, but not plausibly.]

3 f. M **הִרְשָׁעִים**. But historical colouring is deficient. Read **עַל־יָתֵר** (**ב** and **ש** confounded, cp. Ezek. xxii. 25, Cornill). M **יִרְחַמָּאֵל** [ים]. Why mention the string? Read **יִרְחַמָּאֵל**.

5. For **בְּמוֹאֶפֶל** ('in midnight gloom'?—xci. 6) read **בְּמֵאֲרֵב** or **בְּמַחְבֵּא** (x. 8, corr. text). Transposition and slight corruption of letters; **ל** was dittographed. Gr., **בְּמוֹאֶפֶל**. Street (alt.), Lag. **בְּמֵאֲרֵב**. "

6. M **בִּיהַשְׁתוֹת יִהְרֶסוּן שְׁתֵּת** in Isa. xix. 10, is corrupt, and so is **הַשְׁתוֹת** here. It is usual to render 'the pillars,' or 'the foundations.' What the 'pillars' are, is obscure, nor is this fresh figure in itself probable. Philologically, too, the justification of **שֵׁת**, plur. **שְׁתוֹת** from a supposed **שתה** *ponere*, is weak. G S presuppose **הַשְׁתוֹת** (*ἡ κατηπίσω*). Read certainly **בִּיהַשְׁחִיתוּ הִרְשָׁעִים**. M **צִדִּיק מִהַפְּעֵל**. This may indeed be grammatical (Driver, *Tenses*, § 19; Müller, *Synt.*, § 31; Kön., *Synt.*, § 171c), but gives a very poor sense. Read, not **מִהַפְּעֵל** (Ol., We.; cp. on lx. 11), but **פְּעָלָו**. This carries us into the heart of Jewish religious problems.

8. M **עֵינֵינוּ יָחוּז עַפְעַפִּי יִבְחֲנוּ**. G, however, has for the first two words, *οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν πένητα ἀποβλέπουσιν*, i.e. **(לְנֹרְכָה) עֵינֵינוּ**, where the middle word is arbitrarily and unmetrically introduced from x. 8. **לְחַלְכֵּה תַצְפִּינָה**, where the middle word is arbitrarily and unmetrically introduced from x. 8. **עֵינֵינוּ** is certainly the right reading; **תַצְפִּינָה** has been corrupted into **עַפְעַפִּי**; G's text, which was a fusion, also represents **עַפְ**, for it continues *τὰ βλέφαρα αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζει*. **יִבְחֲנוּ** (G *ἐξερ.*) must be a corruption of **תַחֲזִינָה**; this is exactly the sort of corruption which takes place in these contexts. Thus the passage becomes **עֵינֵינוּ תַצְפִּינָה תַחֲזִינָה בְּנִירְאֹם**. (Notice here that U, Syr.-hex., and Theodoret give, instead of *εἰς τὸν πέν.*, *εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην*; this, as Bā. saw, is **לְחַלְד**, and this, as Bā. did not see, is a corruption of **לְחַלְכֵּה** (**לְנֹרְכָה**). Thus the common text of G and the text of U are based on the same Hebrew text, which contains an interpolation from x. 8).

9 f. Read **יְהוָה צִדִּיק אָהֵב**. The **י** in **יִבְחֲנוּ** (M G) comes from a dittographed **י**. M's **חַמֵּס** (**וְאֵהֵב חַמֵּס**) is superfluous, and easily accounted for. **אָהֵב** (or **חֲבֵב**?) is properly a marginal correction of **יִבְחֲנוּ**. After this had intruded into the text, **י** was prefixed and **חַמֵּס** attached, to make sense. G 'A make **וְרָשָׁע** the second accus. to **יִבְחֲנוּ**; but should not **יִבְחֲנוּ** have preceded **צִדִּיק**? Bi.<sup>(1)</sup> makes it do so; but the sense is still not perfect. Metre, sense, and textual criticism are only satisfied by the solution here proposed, which includes the correction of **שְׁנֵאָה נִפְשׁוּ** into **שְׁנֵאָה נִפְשׁוּ**. **שְׁנֵאָה** must have arisen out of a dittographed **שְׁנֵאָה** (**א** and **נ** confounded).

10. M's **יִמְתֵּר** becomes in the || passage cxi. **יִמְיוֹ**, *i.e.* יָוֵן. The psalmist is full of the iniquity of the Jerahmeelite immigration into Palestine. **פָּחִים** can now be accounted for. Read

Cp. on xviii. 49.

11. M **זִלְעָפוֹת**, certainly corrupt. Read **פִּלְצוֹת** (see cxix. 53), and continue **מִנֵּת פִּישָׁם** (cp. on xvi. 5a).

13. M **יִשָּׁר**. Read **יִשְׂרָיִם** (Bi.); cp. G *εὐθύτης* (א<sup>u</sup> A).—M **פְּנִימוֹ**. Has Hebrew a suffix of 3rd sing. in **ם** or **וֹ**? There may be no theoretic objection to it (see Ges.<sup>(26)</sup> § 103 f.; Kön. ii. 1, p. 446a). But there is perhaps no sound example of it. In **עֲלִימוֹ**, Job xxii. 2, the **וֹ** is dittographic. Cp. Diehl, *Das pron. pers. suff. 2 u. 3 pers. plur.*, '95, pp. 20 f. In our passage read certainly

## PSALM XII.

**T**ETRAMETERS (double dimeters). A 'cry of the sufferers' (l. 9). The world is narrowed to Palestine, and here the speakers can see no human virtues. Fraud is the weapon with which they are attacked; their only refuge is a divine promise. In the contents of this oracle there is some affinity to Isa. xxxiii. 10. The pessimism of ll. 1, 2, reminds us of xiv. 1; the description in ll. 3—6 of v. 10; and that in ll. 7f. of lvii. 5. Note the Aramaizing **גִּמְרָה** (see on l. 1f.); the strange word **זִלְתָּ** disappears in a corrected text.

*Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1  | Deliver me, O Yahwè,   for the loyal one disappears,           | 2 |
|    | For the sufferers perish   through the race of Edom!           |   |
|    | Falsely do they speak—   each one to his neighbour,            | 3 |
|    | With flattering lips,   with a double heart they speak.        |   |
|    | May Yahwè cut off   all flattering lips,                       | 4 |
|    | And the [froward] tongue   that speaks grandly,                |   |
|    | Of those that say in their heart,   'Our tongue is our sword,  | 5 |
|    | Our teeth are our spear;   who lords it over us'?              |   |
|    | [Arise, O Yahwè;   deliver, O my God,]                         | 6 |
| 10 | For the cry of the sufferers,   for the groaning of the needy. |   |
|    | 'Now will I arise,'   Yahwè saith,                             |   |
|    | 'I will deliver [the upright] from the toils of the wicked.'   |   |
|    | Yahwè's promises   are unalloyed promises,                     | 7 |
|    | [Like] silver well-tried,   seven times refined.               |   |
|    | Mayest thou, O Yahwè, preserve me,   and guard me              |   |
|    | from Jerahmeel, <sup>1</sup>                                   | 8 |
|    | For the righteous one disappears   through the race of         | 9 |
|    | Edom!  |   |

<sup>1</sup> Cushites, Geshurites, Jerahmeelites.

1 f. The same circumstances (i.e. the Jerahmeelite oppression in Palestine) may possibly be referred to in Isa. lvii. 1. **חֶסֶד** and **עֲנִי** are regular parallels. **גִּמְרֹ** intrans., so lxxvii. 9, but probably not vii. 10 (*q.v.*). **תִּגְמֹר** in Sirach xliii. 4c is difficult and suspicious.

4. **With a double heart.** See on xv. 2 (*l. 4*).—7 f. Cp. lvii. 5.

11. The Psalmist falls into the tone of prophecy (**עֵתָּה אָקוּם יְאֹמֵר** 'י' occurs in Isa. xxxiii. 10). The community, not any chosen individual, is

now the depository of the divine Spirit (cp. on Isa. lxi. 11).

13. **Unalloyed**, i.e. with no admixture of falsehood; contrast **כֶּסֶף נָמָס**, Jer. vi. 30. Similar references to the promises (**אִמְרוֹת**, G *λόγια*) of Yahwè occurs elsewhere; see e.g. xviii. 31, xix. 10 (corr. text), cv. 19, cxix. 140; and cp. Prov. xxx. 5, Wisd. vii. 24 f., James iii. 17. On the refining process, cp. Isa. xlviii. 10. Mal. iii. 2 f. To say that *ll. 11 f.* will be obscure till we know more about the technical details of this process (We., Nestle), is needless despondency (see crit. n.).

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. Read **הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי** (so G).—M **חֶסֶד**. We. would read **חֶסֶד**, but **אֲמוּנִים** in *l. 2* should be **עֲנִיִּים**. Cp. *l. 10*.—M **וְ**. Read **אֶפְסִי** (Gr., La., Du.). See lxxvii. 9. **נֶאֱסַפְי** is also possible. should be

6. Read perhaps **לִשְׁוֹן לְצִים**.—7 f. Read **וְ**. **חֲרִבְנִי שְׁנִינִי**. **ל** is the sole *melic* of **בִּלְבָּם**, which metre requires. M is wildly wrong, but one can see at once how the errors arose. **נִגְבִּיר** is not to be justified from Dan. ix. 27 (see Bevan).

9 f. Insert **יְהוָה הַשִּׁיעָה אֱלֹהֵי** (Du.); so completing the stanza.—For **מִשְׁעָה** read **מִשְׁעָה** (v. 3; cp. Job xxx. 24, xxxvi. 19); so Gr.

12. M **אֲשִׁית בִּישַׁע יִפִּיחַ לוֹ**. **יִפִּיחַ** 'puffs out'? see on x. 5, xxvii. 12. Plainly this cannot be right. G *παρρησιάζομαι ἐν αὐτῷ* (cf. Σ S). Hence Dathe and Bâ. would read **לֹא אֶפִּיעַ** (**ע** and **ח** confounded; cf. xcvi. 11). This is supported by the translations of **הוֹפִיעַ** in *l. 2* (G), lxxx. 2 (S), xciv. 1 (G S). Certainly **אֶפִּיעַ** is just the word to expect in such a context, but, as Kön. remarks (§ 380 f.), **לֹא** makes a halting conclusion to the verse. Read rather **אֲשִׁיעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִחֲבָלֵי רֶשַׁע**, where **רֶשַׁע** corresponds to **בִּישַׁע**, and **יִשְׂרָאֵל** to **יִפִּיחַ**. **יִשְׂרָאֵל** fell out through its likeness to **אֲשִׁיעַ**. See next note.

14. M **צָרוֹה בְּעֵלִיל לְאַרְצִי**. **כְּעֵלִיל** is a great *crux interpretum*; not a hopeless one, however. Various solutions have been offered. (1) Peiser (*ZATW*, '96, pp. 295 f.) would read **בְּדִיל**, on the presumed authority of J, who gives 'separatum a terrâ.' But **צָרוֹה בְּדִיל**, 'purged in respect of tin,' does not give a good sense; no psalmist could have used it. (2) Nestle (*Exp. T.*, March '97) reads **בְּעֵלִי** (rejecting the final **ל** in **בְּעֵלִיל** as a dittogram), and renders 'in a crucible.' But **בְּעֵלִי** in

Prov. xxvii. 22, should mean 'with a pestle'; the sense of 'crucible' is unascertained, and is opposed by the New Heb. usage. And even apart from this, would a Hebrew poet choose an uncommon and ambiguous word like עָלִי in preference to פֹּר (cf. T בכורא)? (3) In *Psalms*<sup>1</sup> I took בעליל to be a gloss on לו אפיע; the word is in fact explained in *Rosh ha-Shana* 21b, by בַּנְלִי, which agrees in turn with S's paraphrase of לו אפיע. But the exact sense of Talm. בעליל is very uncertain, and the true explanation seems to me to be different. (4) בעליל לארע is, equally with לו בישע יפיה, a corruption of בחבלי רשע. These words (now corrupted) stood perhaps already in their wrong order, and a corrector wrote them in the margin in the right order. From the margin this correction (now corrupted) made its way into the text of ver. 6. We have, therefore, no occasion to accept the plausible correction of Houb., Dy., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Peiser, &c., הָרֶץ 'gold' for ארץ[ל]. It is only of silver that the poet speaks. Now as to G's δοκίμιον ἡ γῆ. On this see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, 90, whose suggestion, however, is not good; δοκίμιον (δοκιμείον) certainly = מִצָּרֶה in Prov. xxvii. 21. Cp. controversy in *Exp. T.*, viii. ('97), pp. 236, 287, 336, 379, 432.

15. M תשמרני. Read תשמרני. G φυλάξεις ἡμᾶς; נִי = נו, as often. Similarly read תצרני. Houb., Dy., Bi., Kau., We., adopt נו—for both verbs. Less probably; cp. *l. 1.*—M מִן־הָדוֹר זו 'from such a race as this'? Cp. Delitzsch on דור. But זו = זו is strange, preceded by הדור; it is not enough to call this 'poetic.' Metre shows that either מִן־הָדוֹר זו or לעולם is intrusive. Both words are in fact very pretty corruptions, and spring from the same original ירחמאל. Note Pasek, and see next note.

16. M כֶּרֶם זֶלַת לְבִנֵּי אָרָם (v. l. זֶלַת). Hal.'s view that רם = (cp. T), is not happy. Nor will any slight correction, such as Bā.'s כֶּרֶם (cp. χαρμ in Orig. *Hex.*), 'the vineyard of Israel' [*f. prot. Thcol.*, '82, 601], or Schwally's כֶּרֶם מְזֻמּוֹת [*ZATW*, xi. 258], or even Herz's bolder correction, כֶּרֶם סֶלֶלֶת, suffice to mend כֶּרֶם זֶלַת. Using a little thought, however, as to what is required as a complement to *l. 15*, we can readily correct it. Read פִּינְקֶמֶר צִדִּיק; see *ll. 1, 2*. ז = צ; ל = ד; ת = ק. [Budde's defence (*Exp. T.* xii. 139 f.) of כֶּרֶם זֶלַת involves reading דֹּר זֶלַל, and has little plausibility.] How *v. 9a*, כְּבִיב רִשְׁעִים יִתְהַלְכוּ, got into the text, is an insoluble enigma according to Duhm. The words, however, are a monument of a late editor's skill. He had before him a corrupt and unintelligible form of the words וִירַחֲמָאִים וְאַשְׁרִים, which is a gloss on ירחמאל in *l. 15*.

## PSALM XIII.

**T**ETRAMETERS (double dimeters). Again a psalm of pious Israel; every single expression can be paralleled from unquestionable psalms of the community. Ps. cxvi. may be specially compared. It is true many have viewed Ps. cxvi. as a psalm of any and every pious Israelite. Needless however.

Note that lines 10—12 are probably a later addition (see note).

*Deposited. Marked; Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

1 How long, O Yahwè, | wilt thou forget thy loyal one ? 2  
How long wilt thou hide | thy face from me ?  
How long wilt thou increase | pain in my soul, 3  
Anxiety in my heart | by day and by night ?

How long shall mine enemy | be successful against me ?  
Look hither and answer me, | O Yahwè my God ! 4  
Lighten mine eyes | lest I lie down in Darkness,  
Lest mine enemy say, | 'I have prevailed against him.' 5

My foes triumph, | for I [almost] totter ; \* \* \* \*

*Liturgical Appendix.*

10 But as for me, in thy lovingkindness, | O Yahwè, is my  
trust ; 9  
At thy deliverance | my heart shall triumph ;  
I will sing unto Yahwè, | for he has been my benefactor. -

1. **Forget, &c.** Cp. lxxvii. 10.—  
6. *Lighten mine eyes*, as Ezr. ix. 8, cp.

1 S. xiv. 27, 29.—צִלְמוֹת, a title of  
Sheol; see on xxiii. 4, cvii. 10.—9. *I*  
[almost] totter; cp. xxxviii. 17, xciv.  
17 f. Contrast xvi. 8.—12. נָמַל עָלַי  
Cp. Cyrus cylinder inscr., l. 19, *ignilu*  
'confers benefits upon all

sides' (*KB* iii. b, 124 f.; said of  
Marduk).

10—12. I follow Olshausen. Cf.  
Grimm (*Liturg. App.* 15). Neither  
critic observes that the appendix is so  
arranged as to complete the third  
strophe which had become imperfect.  
G obscures this by tacking on vii. 18b.

*Critical notes.* 1. מ תִּשְׁכַּחַנִּי נָצַח. Duhm renders, 'How long  
dost thou forget me continually,' remarking that 'for ever' (so Del., Bā.,  
Kau. render) implies a very strange notion of eternity, and drawing a  
distinction between נָצַח 'continually' and לְנָצַח 'for ever.' This dis-  
tinction, however, cannot be made out, and equally difficult is the render-  
ing 'altogether,' from the root-meaning 'perfection' (see Ges. *Thes.* 906).  
Considering how unsuitable the meaning 'for ever' is in such passages  
as xiii. 2, and how often נָצַח is corrupt (see *JQR*, xi. 400—403), it becomes

natural to suspect the text (so also in lxxix. 5, lxxxix. 47, &c.). On the analogy of the corrected text of xvii. 15<sup>b</sup> it seems best to read תִּשְׁכַּח עֲדָאֲנָה חֲסִידָךְ. The only alternative would be to read אֶל־נָא instead of עֲדָאֲנָה.

3 f. M אֲשִׁית (תִּאֲסִיף) תוֹסִיף. M עֲצוֹת. Read עֲצָבוֹת, or better עֲצָבָה; so Secker. Street, Dy., Gr., &c., after S.—Add וּלְיָלָה, G (A<sup>ca</sup>); so Kenn., Street, Ley, Bi., Gr., Du. Others (Nöld., Lag., Bā., Kau., We., J. Taylor in *Exp. T.*, v. 336) prefer יוֹם יוֹם, but this is metrically insufficient.

• 7. M פְּנֵי־אֵינִי הַמּוֹת, where הַמּוֹת is taken to be a bold expression for שְׁנַת הַמּוֹת. Lag., לַמּוֹת, 'into death.' But xciv. 17 suggests a more thorough remedy. The figure of 'tottering' (l. 9; cp. xciv. 18) naturally goes together with that of sinking down into the dark world of Sheol, and this suggestion is further confirmed by the preceding phrase, 'Lighten mine eyes.' Read certainly פְּנֵי־אֵשְׁכֵן צִלְמוֹת.

8 ff. M יִכְלְתִּי לוֹ: Usage and metre require יִכְלְתִּי לוֹ (cxxxix. 2, Gen. xxxii. 26, &c.); G πρὸς αὐτόν. So Duhm.—Insert כְּמַעַט (Du.), which easily fell out between כִּי and אֲמוֹט.—Read perhaps יָלַל (cp. on xiv. 7).

## PSALM XIV.

**PENTAMETERS**, except in the appendix. The psalm is parallel to Pss. xi., xii., xxxvi.<sup>(1)</sup>, xlviii., lxxiv. It differs however from Ps. xi. inasmuch as the objects of the scrutiny of the Most High are not mankind in general, but the sons of Edom, who have provoked Yahwē by their profane conduct towards the temple of Jerusalem (cp. lxxiv.<sup>(1)</sup>), and by plotting the ruin of the pious Jewish community (v. 6). They are virtual atheists, for they deny the moral government of Yahwē (cp. ix. 18, x. 4). The psalmist predicts their destruction.

It is hoped that by textual criticism the psalm has been lifted out of the class of merely general psalms, and has become a worthy companion of Ps. lxxiv.<sup>(1)</sup>, to which the reader may be referred (see introduction). The judgment foretold is that of the great Messianic doomsday, when the Edomites, the arch-enemies of Israel, and all who do wickedly, shall be destroyed. Some critics<sup>1</sup> have found a parallelism between v. 6 and Jer. x. 21, 25, and have supposed a reference to the Scythian invasion (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Scythians'); others again have thought that Antiochus Epiphanes ('the fool') or one of the Syrian generals, such as Lysias or Nicanor (see Olshausen), may be aimed at. But it is certain that v. 4 is deeply corrupt, and scarcely doubtful that Jer. x. 17—25 (as a whole or in part) is post-exilic.<sup>2</sup> It may even be reasonably doubted whether there are prophecies on the Scythians anywhere either in the Book of Jeremiah or elsewhere.

There exists a duplicate recension of the psalm, viz. Ps. liii. (described variously as a 'Mahalath,' i.e. Salmæan, and a 'David,' i.e. Ethan, psalm. Apart from less important variations, the distinctive peculiarities of Ps. liii. are—1. that, while in Ps. xiv. the *Tetragrammaton* occurs four (three?) times, in Ps. liii. אֱלֹהִים is substituted for it, and 2, that in liii. 6 (= xiv. 5 f.) we read that the evil-doers were seized with a panic, for God had scattered the bones of the

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* Ol., Del., Bā., Grimme in *ZDMG*, 1896, p. 567.

<sup>2</sup> See N. Schmidt, *Enc. Bib.*, ii. 2388, and Duhm's Commentary on Jeremiah.

besieger, who was put to shame, God having rejected him. As a whole, this may at first appear to be less plausible than the form of text in xiv. 5 f. (M); but it is probable that it is really nearer to the original text. The true text however must, it would seem, be different.

Besides the commentaries see K. Budde's study on Ps. xiv., *Expos. Times*, March, 1901; Cheyne, *OP*, 197, 215 f. On the interpolation after v. 3 in many MSS. of G, quoted in Rom. iii. 13—18, and turned into Hebrew in cod. 649 Kenn, (a Heb. Lat. Psalter at Leyden), see Field, *Hexapla*, on Ps. xiv.

*Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.*

- 1 Gebal says in his heart, | 'There is no God.' 1  
 He has destroyed the castles of Jerusalem, | the habitations  
 of Zion.
- From heaven Yahwè looked down | upon the sons of Edom, 2  
 To see if there were any that cared | for the sanctuary of  
 God.
- The Jerahmeelites were in excitement, | they concerted 3  
 together,  
 They profaned the habitations of Zion, | and her precious  
 things,
- Shall they not be afraid— | all the clans of On? 4  
 Put to shame shall be the Jerahmeelites; | backward shall  
 they turn,
- Utterly panic-stricken are the wicked ones, | for God  
 pursues them.
- 10 The hosts of the tyrants are disgraced, | for Yahwè has 5  
 rejected them.

*Liturgical Appendix.*

- Oh that from Zion were come the deliverance of Israel! 7  
 When Yahwè restoreth his people to life,  
 Jacob will exult, Israel will be glad.

1. **GEBAL.** Used here, as in lxxxiii. 8 (certainly) and in lxxiv. 18b and 22b (probably) as a synonym for 'Edom.' In the Targums and in the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, and, somewhat rarely, in Pesh. (see e.g. Eccus. i. 26, where Pesh. and Vet. Lat. read 'Seir' for 'Samarita'), it represents the Hebrew 'Seir.' Eusebius, too (*Onom.* 125), speaks of Idumæa as 'now called Gebalene.' The name evidently comes from Ar. *jibāl*, 'mountains,' 'mountain-country.' It here represents the

Edomite people, personified as in lii. 3. Cp. xxxvi. 2, where the 'princes of Jerahmeel' (|| 'leader of Edom') is also a personification. No doubt a good sense is given by the common reading נבִל 'the impious one,' i.e. collectively, 'the party of the impious' (cp. xxvi. 4b, xxxix. 9, i. 18?, but not lxxiv. 18, 22); cp. חָנָף, l. 10. One who is נבִל is, not merely a dull or

unintelligent person, but a recklessly immoral man (= a 'son of Belial'); cp. Isa. xxxii. 6. This sense suits all passages with נָבֵל, not excepting Dt. xxxii. 6 (where נָבֵל must have the same sense as in v. 21, i.e. 'impious'). The root-meaning may be 'shameful, contemptible' (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Nabal'). But though 'the impious one says in his heart,' &c., is quite a correct statement, it is more probable that the true reading is a name equivalent to Edom, because of the ascertained reference to the Jerahmeelites in l. 8, if not in l. 5, and the probable reference to the Edomites in l. 3.—*Says in his heart.* So x. 6, 11, 13. The persons referred to were, from a practical point of view, deniers (see on ix. 18) and blasphemers (see on xv. 4.) of God. Cp. also lv. 20b (corr. text), 'void of piety is the house of Jerahmeel; they fear not God.'—2. *He has destroyed*, &c. Lines 1 and 2 briefly sum up the complaints of Ps. lxxiv.<sup>(1)</sup> The ingenuity of the editor who converted l. 2 and the sequel into a denunciation of the immorality of the non-Jewish peoples in general and of faithless Israelites (see *OP*, 342), must be admitted. The form of the last clause and of l. 6 in M's text reminds us of Jer. v. 1; see also Ps. xii. 2—3. According to the received text Yahwè, from his heavenly throne, scrutinizes the human race, to detect, if possible, a single truly religious person. But not one can he discern. In Ps. xi. the same divine scrutiny is affirmed, but the Psalmist assumes the existence of righteous men as a matter of course. It will perhaps be said that the writer of Ps. xiv. does so too in vv. 4—6. True; but in vv. 1, 3, according to M, this writer expressly denies that there are any righteous men at all. This ought to make us suspect the text, and dig down till we can bring out something better and more consistent with the sequel. See crit. notes.

3. **Upon the sons of Edom.** Cp. Gen xviii. 20 f. The Edomite hosts have concerted their meeting; Yahwè notices this, and looks to see whether any one draws them back from their profanation of the temple.

5. See introd. Parallel, ii. 1, xlvi. 5, lvi. 6, 8, lxxiii. 6.—6. Cp. Ps. lxxiv. 7, Isa. lxiv. 11 [10], Lam. i. 10.

7. **Be afraid.** Less probably,

'know, experience' (the consequences of their folly); cp. Hos. ix. 7, Job xxi. 19. See crit. n.—*All the clans of On.* Cp. xcii. 7, lxxviii. 18 (corr. text). On was the name of a region in N. Arabia (see Hab. iii. 7, where On, Cushan, and Misrim are most probably mentioned together). The name also found its way into Judah and Benjamin (Jerahmeelite families). Still, the received reading, 'all the workers of wrong,' is not impossible. See crit. n.

8. Among other parallels, cp. lvi. 10 (corr. text), 'The Arabians will be put to flight. | The Jerahmeelites | will stumble.' The received text is corrupt; 'eaters of my people have eaten bread' seems impossible. The slight corrections indicated in the course of the crit. note, do not touch the heart of the problem.

9. Is the verb retrospective or prospective, i.e. does the poet look back on the destruction of Sennacherib (Theod. M ps., G. Baur, Hitz.), or of some post-exilic tyrant (Ol.), or does he look forward to a retributive judgment which is very soon to take place? Duhm is certainly right in adopting the latter alternative. Cp. xlvi. 6, and, for the picture of the pursuing God, ii. 4 (corr. text), xxxv. 5. The troublesome שֶׁם in M is corrupt (see crit. n.).

—10. Parallels, v. 11, lv. 24b (corr. text). See crit. n.

11 ff. Line 11 is an ejaculation (cp. on xxvii. 12), and the whole appendix is designed to relieve the intense gloom of the preceding psalm (cp. Grimm, *Liturg. App.*, 16 f.). Zion and deliverance are closely connected ideas; cp. cxxi. 1, Isa. lii. 7 f., lxxvi. 6.

12. **Restores his people to life.** The ordinary reading (on which see especially Preuschen, *ZATW* xv. 1—74) has as yet received no satisfactory explanation. It is true, there is no certain pre-exilic evidence for the phrase שׁוּב לְחַיֵּיתָנוּ. We might therefore render '(when Yahwè) reverses the captivity,' and suppose the phrase to have been suggested by the sad experiences of the captivities. For transitive שׁוּב see Num. x. 36, and cp. G; note also the analogy of Ar. *raga'a* 'rediit.' and also 'reduxit.' Barth's view (*ZDMG* xli. 617 f.) also



deserves attention. He thinks that the phrase means literally, 'to collect the collection (of a people, or of a man),' comparing Ar. *thabā*, 'collegit' (more common in stem II. than in stem I.). An Arabic proverbial saying of the same type means 'to restore what is in disorder.' König (*Synt.* § 210 f.) is half inclined to accept this view, but the existence of two synonymous roots **שׁוּב** and **שָׁבַה** seems to the present writer very improbable. On the whole, considering 1. how many of the lexical problems of the O.T. are only apparent, being due to textual corruption,

and 2. that some at any rate of the passages which contain **שׁוּב שָׁבַה** must be corrected, it seems the most critical course to seek for a critical correction of the reading (here and elsewhere). No figure for national disorganization is more frequent and more expressive than that of death; and there is reason to think that it is this figure which is really employed by the poet. Thus this liturgical addition to Ps. xiv. becomes exactly parallel to that beautiful passage, cxxvi. 1, 2. See crit. note.

*Critical Notes.* 1. M **נָבַל**, an enigmatical term which should probably be corrected into **נָבַל** (lxxiv. 18, 22?—lxxiii. 8). The editor, who did not understand the historical background of the psalm, or who wished to efface references to it, changed this into **נָבַל**. See exeg. note.

2. The vague generality of M is intolerable. Underlying the text we may probably see these words,—**הַשְׁחִית אֲרָמְנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל מִשְׁכְּנֹת צִיּוֹן** (cp. Lam. ii. 2, 5). **אֵין עֲשָׂה טוֹב** implies the transposition of **צִיּוֹן**; **א** and **צ** confounded, as in **אוֹן** in Isa. i. 13 (cp. G). **עֲשָׂה** comes from **מִשַּׁח** (= **מִשַּׁח**). As a matter of idiom, neither the **עֲלִילָה** of M in xiv. 1, nor the **עוֹל** in liii. 2, is very satisfactory.

3 f. Point **בְּנֵי-אָדָם** (see xii. 2, xciv. 10 f., corr. text), and so restore colour.—M **מִשְׁפִּיל דִּרְשׁ אֶת-אֱלֹהִים**. Good Hebrew, but too vague. Read, transposing two words, and reading **ק** for **כ**, and **ד** for **ל**, **דִּרְשׁ אֶת-מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהִים מִשְׁפִּיל** would also be possible, but for the repetition of this word.

5. M **הִפֵּל סָר**. Ps. liii., **כָּלָה סָר**, but **סָר** in Kal is doubtful (see on lxxx. 19). First, **כָּלָה** and **כָּלוּ** come from **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**; cp. **חֲלָקִי** in xvi. 8 (crit. n.). Next, remembering ii. 1, &c. (see exeg. n.), we see underlying **סָר** and **סָר** (combined) the familiar **רָנְנוּ יִרְחַ**. **יִרְחַ** can have two beats.—M **נֶאֱלַחֵי** (so too Ps. liii.). **נֶאֱלַח** again only in Job xv. 16, where read **נִגְעַל**. Here we should restore **נִגְעַדִּי**; cp. xlvi. 5. But **נֶאֱלַח** also represents another word (see on l. 6).

6. First part as l. 2b with the addition of **חֲלָלִי** (underlying **נֶאֱלַחֵי**).—M **אֵין נִסְ-אֶחָד**. Read probably **וּמִחֲמִדִּיהָ** (Isa. lxiv. 10, Lam. i. 10).

7. M **יִדְעִי**; G **ז** J T and some MSS. **יִדְעִי** (so Hi., Kamph., Nowack). The latter is preferable, but **יִירָאֵי** is still better.—M

This may perhaps be right, but it looks like an ingenious

editorial substitute for **בְּלֹא־לֶפִי אֹן** (see xcii. 8, corr. text ; lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> l. 42). Cp. Hab. iii. 7, where **אֹן** has again become **אָן** (Perles, *Analekten*, 66), and the name Beth-aven (Beth-on).

8. M **אֶכְלוּ עֲמֵי אֶכְלֵי**. Impossible. Easier would be **לֶחֶם לֶחֶם** (but why not **בֶּשֶׂר**?) ; or **לֶחֶם [אלהים]** . . . For ritual sense of **לֶחֶם** see Num. xxviii. 2, Lev. iii. 11, xxi. 6. The 'food of Yahwè' would be the fat pieces of the sacrifices ; the priests might be the persons referred to (cp. Mal. i. 6—8, 10a). But in such a passage as that before us no superficial correction is of value. Hence, too the **אֶל וְלֶחֶם** of Bevan and Wellh. (*Skizzen*, vi. 168), the **אֶכְלוּ** of Bāthgen, and the **אֶכְלֵי** of Lagarde (*Symmikta*, i. 162) will not help us. What we want is plain after the foregoing emendations. **לֶחֶם** as elsewhere (**בֵּית-לֶחֶם**, **נִימְלַח**) comes from **יִרְחַמָּאֵל**, and l. 8a should probably run, **יִבְלְמוּ יִרְחַמָּאֵלִים**. — M **יְהוָה לֹא קָרָאוּ**. Read **יִשׁוּבוּ לְאַחֹר** (ix. 4, lvi. 10) ; **ק** and **ח** confounded.

9 f. Cp. Merx, *Hiob*, p. lv.—M **שָׁם**, followed by Pasek. Read **לֹא-הָיָה פָּחַד בִּי-אֱלֹהִים פֹּר**. In Ps. liii., where two corrupt forms of the true text stand side by side. The true reading probably is **לֹא-הָיָה בִּי-אֱלֹהִים רֹדֵף [ם]** is one of the odd disguises of **אלהים** which we sometimes find in the Psalms ; **בְּדוּר** and **פֹּר** are both miswritten for **רֹדֵף**. — M **צָדִיק : עֵצַת עֲנִי תִבְיֶשׁוּ פֹר**. Ps. liii., **עֵצֹמוֹת חֲנָף הַבִּישָׁה**. Merx (l.c.) prefers the second form. More wisely, Bā. and Duhm use this as a means of correcting the first form, but with the same freedom which we should claim in the critical use of an ancient version. In xiv. 6 (= l. 10) they read **עֲנִי הַבִּישׁוּ [מַעֲצַת מַעֲצַת]** 'with the plot (or plots) against the wretched (*gen. obj.*) they are put to shame,' correcting M's **תִּבְיֶשׁוּ** in accordance with G's *κατασχύνθησαν* in liii. 6. Certainly the 3 pers. plur. is much more probable than 2 plur. or 2 sing., and the **מ** in the **עֲצֹמוֹת** of Ps. liii. is probably genuine (as Prof. T. K. Abbott also sees). But 'plots of the wretched' for 'plots against the wretched' is not acceptable. Read most probably **מִחֲנוֹת** **עָרִיצִים הַבִּישׁוּ**, and note that **עָרִיצִים** occurs, close by the second recension, in liv. 5. How is this obtained? **מִחֲנוֹת** is doubly represented ; in Ps. liii. by **חֲנָף** (so G) **וֹת**, and in Ps. xiv. by **עֲנִי** (probably comes from **מ**) ; **עָרִיצִים** in Ps. liii. by **עֲצֹמ**, and in Ps. xiv. by **עָרִי** (probably comes from **ם**). Not impossible, however, for **עָרִי** we should read **מִחֲקָהוּ**. Ps. liii., **מִאָּסָם**, which makes the best sense.

12 f. M **יִשְׁבוּ י' שְׁבוֹת**. Both here and in lxxv. 2 and cxxvi. 4, the phrase **שְׁבוּ, שְׁבוֹת**, and in cxxvi. 1 **שְׁבוֹת, שְׁבוֹת**, are more than

probably corrupt (see exeg. note). Note too that the trans. שׁוּב is a very doubtful element in the vocabulary of the Psalter, lxxxv. 5 being probably corrupt. Let us now turn to the other O. T. passages quoted for transitive שׁוּב. The only pre-exilic passage is Nah. ii. 3, where we should perhaps read כִּי יִשָּׁב (Kön., Synt. v 226a). Dt. xxx. 3, Jer. xxx. 3, Ezek. xxix. 14, Hos. vi. 11, Joel iv. 1, Am. ix. 14, Job xlii. 10 (K<sup>r</sup>.), are all exilic and post-exilic. The correction, therefore, must be one specially suited to the exilic and post-exilic periods. Read בְּשׁוּבֵי נַפְשׁ, and see further on lxxxv. 2b. — Read perhaps יָגֵל (see on xiii. 6).

## PSALM XV.

**T**RIMETERS. 'This is at once a psalm of teaching and of rebuke. There are those who frequent the temple-services without observing the 'weightier matters of the law.' They are no true citizens of Zion; and the blessing of security amidst the troubles which precede the Messianic deliverance will not be theirs. Religion is morality; our psalmist is in complete accordance with Zech. viii. 16 f., which expresses the conditions on which Yahwè will deliver his people, and make them no longer a curse but a blessing. The object of the psalm is to erect an invisible but effective wall of partition between true Israelites—the '*aniggim*' and those who are influenced by them—and those merely formal Israelites who are in league with the openly lawless ones. See l.<sup>(4)</sup> and cp. v. 5—8, xxiv. 3—5, Isa. xxxiii. 14—16 (cp. *OP* 237, and, on the true text, *SBOT, Isa.*, Hebrew edition, 21, 107), Ezek. xviii. 5—9. Evidently this psalm is intended for the ordinary man; we must not look here for the highest Israelitish ideal. Renan calls it 'une petite Thora abrégée'; cp. Bertholet, *Die Stellung*, &c., 193.

*Marked: of 'Arab-ethan.*

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  | O Yahwè ! who can be a guest in thy palace ?       |    |
|    | Who can dwell upon thy holy mountain ?             |    |
|    | He that lives blamelessly and acts righteously,    | 2  |
|    | And speaks the truth unfeignedly.                  |    |
|    | He that slanders not his fellow, <sup>1</sup>      | 3  |
|    | And utters no scandal against his neighbour,       |    |
|    | In whose sight a blasphemer is despicable,         | 4a |
|    | But the fearers of Yahwè he honours ; <sup>2</sup> | 4b |
|    | He that puts not out his money at usury,           | 5  |
| 10 | And takes no bribes against the innocent ;         |    |
|    | He that acts thus [is secure],                     |    |
|    | For all time he cannot be shaken.                  |    |

<sup>1</sup> That does no ill to another.

<sup>2</sup> The Jerahmeelite is despised.

1. **Who may be a guest,** כִּי יִנָּיִן. This and the parallel passages in which the same phrase occurs (v. 5?—lxi. 5), or in which the same idea is expressed (xxiii. 6b, xxvii. 5, xxxi. 20 f., xxxvi. 8—10, lxxv. 5), are protests against the heathenish acceptance of phrases like 'Guest of God' (Ger-sakkun = Guest of Sakkun, Germelkart = Guest of Melkart, Gerastart = Guest of Astarte, Gerhekal = Guest of the temple<sup>1</sup>). 'To be the guest of Baal or Ashtoreth, or the false Yahwè, was to be a frequent visitor to the shrine of the god, to be lavish in sacrifices, and punctual in all ceremonial duties, and the reward of the "guest" was to have a share of the sacrificial feasts, and a mystic connection with the deity, which ensured supernatural protection. 'To be the guest of the true Yahwè was indeed different from this, but still something to be enjoyed, and not merely hoped for. It was to have solved the enigma how it was possible to dwell in Yahwè's house all the days of one's life; it was to present spiritual sacrifices in a spiritual temple.'<sup>2</sup> The phrase 'guest (gēr) of Yahwè' by no means expresses a timid though earnest legalism.<sup>3</sup> It does indeed express humility, but not timidity. Such a gēr is sure that his 'guestship' will endure while life shall last, and, like the Israel of which he is a member (lxi. 5), he can sing for joy. Cp. οἰκέτοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, Eph. ii. 19.

4. **Unfeignedly,** בְּלִבְבוֹ; contrast xii. 3, בֶּלֶב וּלֵב, i.e. with

duplicity (cp. 1 Chr. xii. 33). בְּ makes both cases adverbial. Cp. 'Heart,' *Enc. Bib.* The later Biblical writers represent truth-speaking as the special note of the true Israelites, as opposed to the lying and fraudulence of their opponents (see Isa. lix. 3, 4, 13, and cp. *JRL*, 115, 121 f.). Note the same phenomenon in Zoroastrianism (see the Gāthās *passim*, and cp. the horror of lies expressed by Darius). The Egyptians, however, vied with Israelites and Persians; cp. the great 'negative confession' pronounced before the tribunal of Osiris (Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.*, 188 ff.). The Israelites were slow to recognize the full range of truthfulness. Cp. on xvii. 2.

7. **A blasphemer.** The idea of נִאָץ is contemptuous rejection (especially of the true God, or of men or things connected with Him), whether expressed in word (as here, and in x. 3, lxxiv. 10, 18, also in Num. xiv. 11, 23, Isa. lii. 5), in thought (as in x. 13), or in act (as in 1 S. ii. 17, 2 S. xii. 14, where omit אִיבִי, Isa. i. 4, v. 24, Jer. xxiii. 17). The persons meant are the Jerahmeelites and any unworthy Israelites who may abet them (cp. lxxiv. 10, 18).

9. **He that puts not out, &c.** To the poor (and pious) Jew such a man lends without interest (xxxvii. 26, cxii. 5; cp. Prov. xxviii. 8). See Ex. xii. 24, Dt. xxiii. 19, Lev. xxv. 37, and 'Usury,' *Enc. Bib.*—10. Cp. Ex. xxiii. 8, Dt. xvi. 19, Prov. xvii. 23.

*Critical Notes.* 1. M בְּאֶהְלֶךְ. Read בְּהִיכְלֶךְ. Similar errors in xix. 5, xxvii. 5 f., lxi. 5, lxxix. 26, lxxxiv. 11.

5. M לֹא רָגַל עַל-לִשְׁנִי, 'he carries no slander on his tongue' (Del.), 'he is not nimble (cp. new Heb. רָגִיל) with his tongue' (Bä., Du.). Neither rendering satisfies. Parallelism suggests לֹא רָגַל עַל-שִׁכְנִי. In כ became effaced; then the ל in על was dittographed.—Omit M's לֹא-עָשָׂה לְרַעְיוֹ רַעְיָה (also in G), a gloss.

<sup>1</sup> See note in Che., *Psalms*, ed. 1; Driver, note on Dt. xvi. 22; Renan, *Discours et conférences*, 318.

<sup>2</sup> *OP* 387; cp. 429, *Jew. Rel. Life*, 250. <sup>3</sup> Robertson Smith, *Rel. Sem.*<sup>(2)</sup> 78.

7. M נִמָּאֵם, a mere synonym of נִבְּוֶה. G πονηρευόμενος, which is neither נִאֲשֵׁם (Herz) nor נִבְּאֵשׁ (Du.), but a paraphrase of נִמָּאֵם. Read מִנְאֵץ, a synonym of נִבְּל.

8. M's מִשְׁבַּע לְהִרְעֵ וְלֹא יָמַר is (to me) unintelligible. The usual explanation of לְהִרְעֵ (from Lev. v. 4) is unnatural; the supposed parallel in xxxix.<sup>(3)</sup> cannot be maintained. G S presuppose לְרַעְיָה = לְרִיעָה; so Ginsburg, We., Herz. For יָמַר Kön. (i. 466) prefers יָמַר (analogy of עָע verbs). But the word, however explained, is not satisfactory here. The correction of נִמָּאֵם into מִנְאֵץ (l. 7) suggests a more probable reading of the whole clause, viz. נִבְּוֶה יִרְחֵמָאֵלִי, which is a gloss on l. 7.

11. Omit Maḳkef and insert נִכּוֹן (cp. S).

## PSALM XVI.

TRIMETERS. The speaker (i.e. the pious community), rejoices in the sure hope of deliverance from the oppression of its enemies—the Edomites and other races of N. Arabia. In spite of all his sufferings he continues to praise and bless Yahwè, and his one delight is to visit the sanctuary, where he renews that sense of Yahwè's presence and protection which keeps his inner being in perfect peace. Israel is God's 'loyal one,' whom He will not suffer to perish. The Messianic age, and with it the deliverance and glorification of Israel, is at hand. When it comes, life will be life indeed. Yahwè knows the way to this life; he will show it to his people, and fill them with joys past imagining. Cp. on Ps. xvii.

The strongly individualizing tone of the psalm makes it plausible to surmise that the hope of immortality is held out in it to the individual, at any rate if we can satisfy ourselves that there are other psalms (xlix., lxxiii.) in which the same hope is still more clearly expressed. Such an interpretation of those psalms, however, is inadmissible; xlix. 15 f. and lxxiii. 23 f. are not correctly presented in M's text. Nor is the phraseology of Ps. xvi. inconsistent with the view that the endless life referred to in the psalm is that of the pious community of Israel (cp. Ps. xvii.). The individualizing tone of Ps. xvi. is not stronger than that of Pss. iii., iv., and vi., and only proves the strength of the feeling of the solidarity of pious Israelites. Cp. *JRL*, 241—244.

According to Duhm, 'apart from the conventional opening there is no petition and no direct thanksgiving.' In the text as here represented, however, there are both. Few psalms perhaps gain more in clearness of sense and in depth of colouring from a keen textual criticism. For other views, based on the traditional text, see the commentaries and O.T. theologies, and cp. *OP*, 197 f.; 'Eschatology,' *Enc. Bib.*

### *A supplication. Of 'Arab-ethan.*

I

Hear me, O God! according to thy lovingkindness;

Give ear, O Yahwè! to my words.

2

I long to visit thy palace,

3

And in thy sanctuary is all my delight.

- How many are the armies of Jerahmeel, 4  
 The hosts of Edom and Ishmael !  
 Preserve me, O God ! from Zarephath,  
 From Maacath and Cusham-jerahmeel. 5
- The sons of Ammon have fallen upon me, 6  
 10 Yea, thine inheritance they have broken in pieces.  
 I bless Yahwè who will deliver me, 7  
 Yea, from Jerahmeel will he preserve me.
- Yahwè do I magnify continually, 8  
 With him at my right hand I shall stand firm.
- Joyous is my heart and my mind ; <sup>1</sup> 9  
 My body also also rests securely.
- <sup>2</sup> My soul then will not yield to Sheol, 10  
 Thy loyal one thou wilt not abandon to <sup>3</sup> the pit ;  
 Thou will make known to me the path of life, 11  
 20 Thou will satisfy me with joys in thy presence.

2. **Give ear.** Cp. v. 2, xvii. 1-3. The connection between visits to the temple and security from danger is obvious (cp. v. 4, xxvii. 3-6).—5. Cp. iii. 2, and for the collection of ethnic names, lxxxiii. 7-9. The editor, who had to make the best of a corrupt text, seems to have lived in a time when there were many semi-heathen Jews who combined the worship of Yahwè with that of other deities, and whose libations of wine to pagan deities were to him as offensive as the blood of a human sacrifice (cp. the phrase 'the blood of grapes,' Gen. xlix. 11). R. Smith, however, thought that literal blood-libations were meant, and that these were connected with the rite of pouring out the blood of a sacrifice at the base of an altar, which, though extinct among the Israelites, may still have been in use among the 'peoples of the land' (*Exp.* 1876, pp. 341 ff.; cp. *Rel. Sem.*<sup>(2)</sup> 230). He illustrates by Isa. lxv., lxvi. (cp. *Introd. Is.* 316, 364 ff.; *Jewish Religious Life*, 29 f.). But מִדָּם, '(consisting of) blood,' is so awkward that we shall do better to seek for some suitable correction of the reading. It would be strange if this

Psalms had no reference to the arch-enemies of the Jews. See crit. note.

8. The editor has shown great skill (cp. Jer. x. 16, and li. 19 in G), but has not produced a clear piece of Hebrew.—*Maacath.* See lx. 8, and cp. 'Maacath,' *Enc. Bib.*—*Cusham-jerahmeel*, i.e. the Jerahmeelite Cusham or Cush. See 'Shechem,' *Enc. Bib.*—10. *Thine inheritance*, i.e. Canaan, as lxxiv. 2, xciv. 5. 'Thine' involves an appropriate argument. In itself, however, 'mine inheritance' is unobjectionable; cp. cv. 11, Dt. iv. 21, xv. 4, Jer. xii. 14, Ezek. xxxv. 15.

14. בִּלְ-אֶמוֹט (or לֵא) occurs four times again (x. 6, xiii. 5, xxx. 7, lxii. 3 = 7). In none of these cases is it probable that an individual is the speaker.

15 f. The bond of חֶסֶד between Yahwè and his worshipping people secures them from destruction. A dichotomy, not a trichotomy, of human nature is presupposed. לֵב 'heart,' פֶּכֶד 'liver,' and נֶפֶשׁ 'soul' (l. 10)

are treated as virtually synonymous. So in Assyrian, the Sabbath is called *nuh libbi*, but it might as well be called *nuh napisti*, or *nuh kabitti*.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, to the Assyrians and to the Hebrews the heart and the liver are alike organs of the life of the soul. Both are the seats of emotion, but the heart is also the seat of the will, the conscience, and the understanding. The heart thinks, is both an Assyrian and a Hebrew phrase. Hence we can render לֵב 'mind,' and

כֶּבֶד we can paraphrase 'soul' or 'heart.' The extent of the Hebrew use of כֶּבֶד, 'liver,' has been almost overlooked, owing to the Massoretic vocalization. Observe that the only trace in the O.T. of the prophetic faculty often assigned to the liver is in Ezek. xxi. 26 (the king of Babylon). See crit. n.

16. **Rests securely.** Cp. iv. 10, where pious Israel speaks.

17 f. **Sheol**, i.e. the nether world and the *pît* (שְׁחַת), vii. 16, ix. 16, xlix. 10, lv. 24, ciii. 4) are synonymous. Sheol is imagined as a great pit, narrow above (lxix. 16, cxli. 7). A whole people can descend into this abyss (see Isa. v. 14, Ezek. xxxii. 17—32). Israel, however, will escape this dire fate. — *Thy loyal one*, or, 'thy pious one.' The חָסִיד is a אִישׁ חָסֵד (cp. xii. 2, xliii. 1), one who practises חֶסֶד (see 'Loving-kindness,' *Enc. Bib.*). The

חָסִידֵי יְהוָה are the faithful worshippers of Yahwè, xxx. 5, xxxi. 24, xxxvii. 28, l. 5, cxxxii. 9, 16, cxlv. 10, cxlix. 5, i S. ii. 9, Prov. ii. 8; hence the title Ἀσιδαῖνοι in the Maccabæan rising (see 'Asidæans,' *Enc. Bib.*). In the corrected text of xx. 10, xxi. 8, and xxv. 16, also in M T of lxxxvi. 2, Israel, as here, is called חָסִיד; and in cxlv. 17 (so Jer. iii. 12) the epithet is given to Yahwè himself. חָסֵד is in fact the bond which unites Yahwè and the community of Israel. Possibly in cxlix. 5 חָסִידִים has acquired the special meaning 'Asidæans'; at any rate, the persons spoken of had exchanged the student's chamber for the field of battle. The Asidæans are defined in i Macc. ii. 42 as 'every one that offered himself willingly for the law.' Cp. *OP*, 48.

19. **The path of life**, as Prov. v. 6 (sing.), ii. 19 (plur.). More is meant than merely 'the course of action which leads to happiness'; the phrase is Messianic (cp. on xci. 16). So 'the path of glory,' lxxiii. 24b (corr. text).

20. Cp. xvii. 15, xxxvi. 9 f. — *In thy presence*; cp. xxi. 7b (same use of אֵת). As the text stands, that passage may refer to the personal Messiah. But in the true text it is probably Yahwè's 'loyal one' (חָסִיד) who is referred to, precisely as here.

**Critical Notes.** (Title) מַכְתָּם comes either from תַּחֲנוּן (see 'Isaiah,' *SBOT*, Heb., 117), or from תַּחֲנָה (cp. on xxx. 1).

1. M שְׁמֵרְנִי אֵל בְּיַחְסִיתִי בְּדָ. Apart from metre and context this might be right. On metre indeed we must not dwell much, in beginning our study of the psalm; but it is plain that the context refers, not to danger, but to persons or things in which the speaker has pleasure. This is not affected by the circumstance that v. 3 (which should contain the second half of the first stanza) is admittedly very corrupt; the correctness of כָּל חֲפָצִי בָם can hardly be questioned. We might

<sup>1</sup>, 1. liver, 2. disposition, Muss-Arnolt; 1. liver, 2. inward part = centre, Jensen (*Kosmol*, II, note); but Del. only 'Gemüth.' In Heb., however, only לֵב, not כֶּבֶד, has the secondary meaning 'centre.'

emend שמרני into אֲזַמְרֶה, for שמר and זמר are liable to be confounded (see e.g. lix. 10). But adopting this, it will be difficult to obtain a fully satisfactory parallelism for the first couplet. A better solution of the problem can be devised, and one that will fit in with corrections which we shall have to propose for subsequent errors in the text; compare the opening of Ps. xvii.

# יהוה

3 ff. The proposal for l. 2 has now to be justified. Most critics abide by the judgment of Olsh. ('53) that while we should certainly read אֲמַרְתִּי or אֲמַרְתִּי (Houb., Ew., De., Kau. [cp. Ges.-K. § 447], Kön. i. 151; cp. G S J),\* the rest of v. 1, 2 may be retained. On the other hand, it may be urged (1) that the ordinary view of v. 2 pays no regard to parallelism, and (2) that 'my welfare is not above or beside (?) thee' is a very unnatural form of expression for 'Thou art my highest, or my only, good.' None of the Vss. take this view. S S J T translate as if they read בְּלִעְדֶּיךָ בָּל, an inelegant reading adopted by Houb., Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Du. The rendering of G (A R U, B omits) is peculiar—*τὸν ὑψίστων σου οὐ χρείαν* (or *χρ. οὐκ*) *ἔχεις*, i.e. לִי טוֹבָתִי בְּלִיעַל לָךְ, which is interesting from its presupposing the still generally current explanation of בְּלִיעַל. It is wrong, however, being produced by dittography. Next, as to the parallelism. Verses 2 and 3 in M are closely connected, but v. 1 appears like 'a short introit, without any parallel clause' (Del). Clearly we cannot accept this as original. The text of v. 2b must be corrupt, and in correcting it we can have no help from the Vss. Wildeboer (*Feestbundel van Prof. de Goeje*, '91, pp. 47 ff.; *Theol. Tijdschr.*, '93, pp. 610 ff.) proposes בְּעֶלְתֶּךָ טוֹבָתִי, 'the (chief or only) good of thy wedded one' (cp. Isa. lxii. 4). Wellh. and Herz take another course. Both start from G's *χρείαν οὐκ ἔχεις*. The former reads בְּלִיעַל for בָּל עֲלֶיךָ, and (strangely enough) connects 'ב' with v. 3, rendering in v. 2, 'Thou, O Lord, art my good.' The latter, by a too mechanical application of a method which is sometimes useful, produces the unpleasing clause, טוֹב תִּבֶּל בָּל יַעֲלֶךְ. The root of the evil, however, lies deeper, and in attacking it we must aim at a suitable connection with v. 1. If we emended שמרני into אֲזַמְרֶה, we might correct אֲמַרְתִּי ל into אֲרַמְמֶךָ (see on cxviii. 2-4). But אֲדַנִּי אַתָּה will not be a bad parallel alike to כִּי חֲסִיתִי בְךָ and כַּחֲסֹדֶךָ. Taking all things into consideration, the solution offered above seems to be the only possible one.

Line 3 should be read תִּאֲבִיתִי לִפְקֹד הַיְכָלֶךָ. לִפְקֹד is represented in M by לָקַד in לִקְדוּשִׁים and by בָּל (= לֵפ). וְשִׁים [הַיְכָלֶךָ = עֲלֶיךָ]. אֲשֶׁר בְּאָרֶץ, with אֲשֶׁר dittographed], and הִמָּה אֲדִירִי represent two attempts to write וּמִקְדָּשֶׁיךָ. Critics have been hindered partly by



their want of a correct method, partly by their disregard of metre. Bā. values G too highly. The text represented by it can be only an editorial conjecture, which, however skilful, assumes an irregular use of הָמָה, and is opposed to parallelism and context. By retroverting G (see *St. Kr.*, '80, p. 754) he produces כל יִהְיוּ הָמָה יִדְרֵי יְהוּדָה (cp. Isa. xlii. 24, lxii. 4). Emendations, suggested by Isa. lxii. 4, have also been proposed by Beer and Wildeboer. Hitzig's view is different. He acutely explains the last words of v. 3 thus, 'Let it (viz. David's present, 1 S. xxx. 26) be for the holy ones who are in the land' (i.e. the priests). Bi. (1882), somewhat similarly, viewed the words as an explanatory gloss; 'This relates to,' &c. (so Che., '88; Du., '99).

5. M יִרְבּוּ עֲצֻבוֹתָם. If this is to be construed with M's מְהָרֵי, it is awkward in the extreme. Combining suggestions of Wellh. and Dys., Duhm reads יִרְבּוּ עֲצֻבֵיהֶם אֲחֵרִים הָרִי, 'those whose images are many the other (Jews) praise,' viz. by taking part in heathen repasts (see the context); Wellh. emends הָרִי into אֲנָכִי. It would be simpler to read יִרְוִי מְעַצְבוֹת (cp. xxxvi. 9), and continue אַחֵר בָּחָרִי (בָּחַר, a special word for a worshipper's entering into mystic relation to his god). Bā., in *JPT*, '82, p. 603, proposed הִמְרִי (for מְהָרִי), but see Lag. *Mittheil.*, iii. 11. Bā. has himself withdrawn this, and despairs of the text. But, though the new emendation proposed above is in itself possible, it does not restore the true text. The key to the problem is in the little word אַחֵר which (like אַחֵר in 1 Chr. vii. 12 and הָאֲחֵר in 1 K. xii. 30) is one of the many corrupt fragments of יִרְחֵמָל. יִרְבּוּ and מְהָרֵי are both corruptions of מְהָרֵרֵי, however, also represents another fragmentary form of יִרְחֵמָל.

6 ff. M בִּלְאִסְפִּי נִסְפִּיָּהֶם מָדָם. See exeg. note. בִּלְאִסְפִּי may be disregarded; it has arisen out of יִרְחֵמָל, the letters of which were first transposed (through the scribe's ignorance of history) and then corrupted; 'ירח' was probably a marginal correction. וּבִלְאִשָּׁא which follows is a similar corruption of יִשְׁמַעֵאל. נִסְפִּי is probably miswritten for מִחְנִי (מ and ס again confounded). מָדָם represents either אָדָם or אֲדָמִים; see on li. 16.—M אֶת־שְׁמוֹתָם עַל־שִׁפְתֵי. The initial אֶת seems to be an editorial insertion. שְׁמוֹתָם may come from שְׁמֵרֵנִי; certainly this is favoured by the context. עַל=אֵל; שִׁפְתֵי naturally comes from צִרְפָּת. Then follows, in M, a conglomerate of editorially transformed corruptions. The clearest are כּוֹסִי and גּוֹרְלִי, i.e. כּוֹשֶׁם (cp. xi. 6b) and יִרְחֵמָל. חֲלָקִי too is really an ethnic name (cp. חֲלָקִי[ה], Hilki [ah])—a popular corruption of יִרְחֵמָל; cp. הַכֹּל in xiv. 3a. As for מִנָּת and תּוֹמִיד (for which Hi., Dy., Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We. read תְּמִיד; Lag.

one can hardly fail to see underlying them both מַעֲכֵת (the

southern Maachah) ; **אתה** may also perhaps represent (cp. 'Metheg-ammah,' *Enc. Bib.*). **גורלי** is plainly from **ירחמאל**. This latter word should probably (see 'Shechem,' *Enc. Bib.*) be attached to **נושם** rather than to **מעכת**. Read therefore, as stanza 2 :

9f. M חֲבָלִים נָפְלוּ לִי בַּנְּעִימִים is suspicious, and the whole of v. 6 is inconsistent with the cry for divine protection. 'Sweet,' 'delightful,' &c., are no doubt idealistic titles of Canaan (cvi. 24, Mal. iii. 12, Jer. iii. 19, Ezek. xx. 6, 15, Dan. viii. 9, xi. 6, 41), but we do not expect any one of them here. חֲבָלִים = חמלים = ירחמאל (cp. 'Hamul,' 'Mahol,' *Enc. Bib.*), an early correction of גורלי. Read, as l. 9, נָפְלוּ עָלַי. —אֶפְרַיִם נִחַלַת שְׁפָרָה עָלַי —M בְּנֵי-עַמּוֹן לִי (l. 9). The whole line should run, אֶפְרַיִם נִחַלַת שְׁפָרָה עָלַי. (G S, Ol., Gr., Bi., We., Du.) is also possible.

12. M אֶפֶר־לִילוֹת יִסְרוּנִי כְלִיּוֹתַי. Wrong; it is not man's 'reins that teach him, but God. לִילוֹת too is unexpected. It comes from כְּלִיּוֹת (cp. on xvii. 3, לִילָה). כָּל, however, is of course not correct. If יִסְרִי (יִסְרָנִי) is right, we might read בְּמַעֲנֵלוֹתַי (xvii. 5, xxxii. 8b, corr. text). But we require some reference to the foes. Read אֶפֶר־מִיֶּרְחָמָאֵל. יִשְׁמְרֵנִי is supported by שׁוֹיְתִי (v. 8), an unexpected and improbable word, which seems to have come from יִשְׁמְרֵנִי, a dittogram, perhaps a correction of a scribe's error.

15. Omit **לִכֹּן** (note *Paseḳ*), which mars the metre, and springs from a premature **לִבִּי**. **כִּי** and **כֵּן** are often confounded.—Omit **וַיִּגַּל** (metre).—M **פְּבֹדִי**. G *ἡ γλῶσσά μου*. Point **פְּבֹדִי**. So Houb., Street, and more recently Hi., Hal., Ball, Di. In Gen. xlix. 6 G has *τὰ ἡπαρὰ μου*. Cp. vii. 6, xxx. 13, lvii. 9, cviii. 2, also Isa. xvi. 11 (reading **פְּבֹדִי** for **קַרְבִּי**; cf. Lam. ii. 11).

Du. Cp. on lxxxix. 20. The superfluous י was caused by the י preceding ד; for parallel cases see Gen. xvi. 5, Ezek. ix. 5, 1 S. xxvi. 8, where too the Kri deletes the י. Wellh., however, and Matthes (*Th. Tijdschr.*, 1901, p. 545) adhere to Kt.

20. M שבע. Read certainly תשביעני (contrast to יריוו, *l.* 5). G πληρώσεις με.—M G append נעמות בימין נצח. Strange, that all the stanzas of Ps. xvi. have four lines except (at first sight) the fifth; also that the four preceding lines all have a verb, while the fifth has none, which is the more remarkable, as the adverb [ל]נצח follows. The truth is that for the present text we should read חסד במשכנותיך. This is also the true close of Ps. xvii. By accident it was copied into Ps. xvi. from the column in which Ps. xvii. was written. Cf. 'Psalms Book of,' *Enc. Bib.*

## PSALM XVII.

**T**ETRAMETERS. A prayer of the pious community (cp. Coblenz, 102). The speaker bases his sure confidence that his prayer will be answered on his proved fidelity to Yahwè. After crying aloud for help against the Jerahmeelites, pious Israel enters into an earnest self-justification (*ll.* 3-10). He then appeals for protection, as Yahwè's client, in the sanctuary (*ll.* 11-16). He describes the imminent danger in which, regarded apart from Yahwè, he stands (*ll.* 17-24), and being of sensitive nature (for Israel must be represented in colours borrowed from the Israelites), he breaks out into a vehement demand for a terrible retribution to his enemies (*ll.* 25-28). He doubts not that prayer will be granted, for the Messianic age is close at hand, when Yahwè's *hásid* (pious one) will be admitted to a more completely satisfying vision of the divine countenance in the sanctuary (*ll.* 29 f.), which cannot be till the land of Israel has been relieved from the blighting presence of Israel's deadly foes. Who those foes are, we learn from the probably true text of *ll.* 2, 7, 21 and 26, where they are called the tribe of Jerahmeel, Edom, Zarephath and the Geshurites; indeed, the parallelism between this psalm and Pss. v., vii., x., xi., xvi., xviii., xxii.,<sup>1</sup> especially the four latter, would seem to leave no doubt that the peoples of the N. Arabian border are referred to. It should be added that Pss. xvi. and xvii. are also closely connected by their parallel ending, and that both are akin to the large group of psalms expressing ardent love of the temple, and especially to Pss. xxvii. and lxi.,—psalms on which not a little fresh light can be thrown. Like Ps. xvi., this is a psalm of national, not personal, immortality.

The psalmist has often been accused of abruptness in his transitions. But this supposed abruptness is due to textual corruption. Criticism, which can do much to remove this corruption,<sup>2</sup> at the same time unfortunately reveals a want of literary originality in the psalm. Some of the ideas and forms of expression which are most characteristically post-exilic are to be found here. The points of contact with the nine psalms mentioned above are specially remarkable. In this connexion it may be noticed that the reading חבלי מות in *l.* 19, if correct, points to a date long enough after that of Ps. xviii. for the text of that psalm

<sup>1</sup> Observe that a part of the description of the terrifying 'snares' and 'floods' given in Ps. xviii. recurs in xvii. 10 (restored text), and that the representation of the Jerahmeelites or Edomites as lions, wild oxen with pointed horns (?), and traitors given in Ps. xxii. recurs in passages of Ps. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> From another point of view several criticisms of the text of Ps. xvii. are offered by J. Kennedy in a not yet (March, 1902) published paper. See on *ll.* 1, 24.

(v. 5a) to have become corrupt ; the interval between the two psalms must not, however, be exaggerated ; textual corruption evidently began very early. In conclusion, it is somewhat strange that Duhm should represent Ps. xvii. as the work of a Pharisee, as if assertions of legal righteousness began with the party called Pharisees, and should even emend פָּרִיץ (v. 4) into

‘Pharisee.’ Surely none of the psalms can safely be brought down to the age of the Pharisees, or indeed ascribed to an individual of any age.

*Prayer. Of ‘Arab-ethan.*

I

- Hear my cry, O Yahwè ! | attend unto my wail ;  
 Make haste to rescue me | from the tribe of Jerahmeel,  
 Let my sentence proceed | from thy presence [in righteous-  
 ness] ; 2  
 Let thine eyes view | [the pious] with exactness.  
 If thou triest my heart, | if thou provest my reins, 3  
 No deceit wilt thou find, | in my heart is no [wrong].  
 From the courses of Edom, | from the ways of Zarephath— 4  
 I have kept myself, O Lord ! | from the paths of liars.  
 My steps follow close | in thy courses ; 5  
 10 My feet waver not | [in thy paths].  
 O Lord ! I call upon thee, | thou wilt answer, O [my]  
 God ! 6  
 Bend down to me thine ear, | hear my speech.  
 Separate thy loyal one | in thy sanctuary, 7  
 And keep him close | in thy habitation.  
 Preserve me, O Lord ! | in the courts of thy house, 8  
 With the shadow of thy wings | cover thou me.  
 From the (angry) face of the wicked | deliver thou me, 9  
 To the greed of mine enemies | [abandon me not].  
 The snares of Deathland | encompass me, 10  
 20 The floods of ocean | affright me ;  
 [For] there surround me | the troop of Geshurites, 11  
 With pointed horns | they mangle me (?).  
 They attack me like lions | which watch for prey, 12  
 [They encompass me] like young lions | which lurk in  
 coverts.  
 Arise, O Yahwè ! | and make him bow down ; 13  
 Rescue my soul | from the wickedness of the godless.

Do thou, O Yahwè ! rain | hot coal upon them ; 14  
With a horrible blast | do thou fill their belly.

As for me, by [thy] righteousness | I shall behold thy face ; 15  
30 I shall be satisfied with thy lovingkindness | in thy  
habitation.

1 f. רנה, 'wail,' || תפלה, 'prayer,' as Jer. vii. 16, xi. 14.—*With lips that are truthful.* Truthfulness is a primary note of the righteous character in early Judaism—truthfulness towards men (v. 9, xv. 2 [note], lii. 3, Isa. liii. 9, lix. 4), and also towards God (lxvi. 18 f.). The prayer of the untruthful wicked must be an abomination (v. 4 f.; Prov. xv. 8, 29).—5 f. *If thou triest*, &c. The community can speak thus more easily than the individuals. 'Reins,' || 'heart,' as vii. 10 (gloss?), xxvi. 2, Jer. xi. 20, xvii. 10, xx. 12, where too בֶּחַן or צָרָה, or both words, occur; also in lxxiii. 21. 'Heart' = conscience. Cp. 'Heart,' 'Reins,' *Enc. Bib.* Our revised text is without the troublesome word לִילָה, which led Duhm to suppose that this was an evening psalm; just so (l. 7) it is without the unseemly phrase, 'the word of thy (God's) lips.' In l. 8 notice the interesting word פָּרִיץ.

The word also occurs in Jer. vii. 11, Ezek. xviii. 10, Dan. xi. 14, but not in the true text of Ezek. vii. 22 (read צִרְפָּתִים, see *Crit. Bib.*), and of Isa. xxxv. 9 (read חֵית הָאָרֶץ). It means, not 'a violent one' (= robber), but 'a liar' = בִּזְשֵׁשׁ and (partly) בִּגְדָן. The noun פָּרִץ occurs probably in Nah. iii. 1 (M's פָּרֶק is unsuitable) and in Jer. vi. 6 (read הִפְרִץ; cp. G). The root is פָּרַץ, 'to lie,' = Ass. *parṭsu* (so Ruben for פָּרַץ in Nah., *l.c.*); in Hos. iv. 2 read בִּאֲרִץ (G, Ruben). On Duhm's suggestion (פרִיץ for פָּרִיץ) see above.—13. הִפְלָה; cp. lxx. viii. 18, but not l's. iv. 4 (see crit. n.).—חֲסִידָה; cp. on xvi. 10.

14. Cp. xxvii. 5. מִשְׁכְּנֹת, Yahwè's dwelling, the temple, as xlvi. 5, lxxxiv. 2, cxxxii. 5. So in l. 30.—15. The revised text deprives us of a parallelism with Dt. xxxii. 10 f., Zech. ii. 8. Certainly the received text (v. 8a) is plausible; Tylor has shown that the pupil of the eye is connected elsewhere in folk-lore with the soul (*Prim. Culture*, i. 389). But parallelism is opposed to the common text.

17. פָּנִים, 'angry face,' as xxi. 10.—18. So xxvii. 12. Lines 19—28 (vv. 10—14) seem to be illustrations of striking passages in Pss. xi., xviii., xxii.; see crit. notes.—21. *Geshurites*, i.e. the N. Arabian oppressors, probably = 'Maacathites' (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Geshur,' ii.). Cp. iii. 8b. Or perhaps read 'Ishmaelites' (see crit. n.).

23 f. אֲרִיהַ and כִּפִּיר are collectives (like אֲרֵי, xxii. 14b).

29. *Behold thy face.* So xi. 7, cxl. 13; cp. xvi. 11. On the divine Face, cp. Dillm. on Ex. xxxiii. 14. The תְּמוּנָה of M may have been suggested by Num. xii. 8. The view of the editor apparently was that Israel and (note בְּהִקִּיץ) each faithful Israelite would enjoy the same privileged vision of Yahwè as 'my servant Moses' (Num. xii. 7); cp. *OP*, 388 ff., 407, 426, 430, 444, and Baethgen's commentary. It is true, some (e.g. Smend, *ZATW*, 1888, p. 95) explain הִקִּיץ of the hoped-for divine intervention in behalf of Israel. But this bare use of the infinitive is unparalleled, and the expression 'I shall be satisfied with thy form,' is intolerable. Hence Beer (*Indiv. psalmen*, 18) and Wellh. regard תָּמָּ as the subject of הִקִּיץ. The 'awaking of God's form' is taken to mean the revelation of the divine glory at the judgment. This, however,

is also unparalleled. If this view of the construction were correct, it would be necessary to emend 'תָּמָ' into or rather (see *Jewish Rel.*

*Life*, p. 241) קִנְאָתְךָ. If, however, we put aside the current exaggerated belief in the Massoretic text, and apply a stricter critical method, a much better result can be obtained (see crit. n.).

*Critical Notes.* 1. M יהוה י וצדק. G, κύριε τῆς δικαιοσύνης μου, i.e. 'O Yahwè, who art my righteousness' (see on xviii. 2). But this is against the parallelism. Either צדק has come in from the margin, where it was perhaps placed as having been omitted in v. 2a, or (as J. Kennedy acutely suggests) it is a corruption of צַעֲקָתִי. In the former case, רַנְתִּי should be placed in l. 1a, and תַּפְלִיתִּי in l. 1b (cp. lxi. 1, and see on qn l. 2). But the latter suggestion is the better.

2. M's בְּלֹא שִׁפְתַי מִרְמָה is strange Hebrew, and the whole clause, 'Give ear unto my prayer (that is uttered) with no deceitful lips' (Driver), is a weak supplement to 'Hear my cry, attend to my wail.' Ps. xvi. 4—6 leads us to expect a reference to the N. Arabian oppressors, and, quite without a thought of this passage, the present writer has found himself compelled in another psalm (xliii. 1) to emend מִרְמָה into יִרְחֵמָאֵל. Instead, therefore, of giving תַּפְלִיתִּי a double rôle (1. as parallel in l. 1b to רַנְתִּי, and 2. as the representative of מִתְפַּלֵּל), it is most probable that we should, on the analogy of xliii. 1, read l. 2 thus,

חִוְשָׁה לִפְלִטְנִי | כִּמְשַׁפַּחַת יִרְחֵמָאֵל:

חִוְשָׁה for הַאֲזִינָה (cp. on lxxx. 2a) is not as difficult as it may seem, for the נִי in the latter word may have come from תַּפְלִטְנִי (letters mis-arranged). בְּלֹא appears to be from חָלָא=כָּלָא (a bit of יִרְחֵמָאֵל).

3 f. Insert צדק, as a || מִיִּשְׁרִים (cp. ix. 9). The adverbial accus.; cp. Jer. xi. 20 שִׁפְט צדק בְּחֵן כְּלִיֹּת וְלֹב (l. 6). Also insert חֲסִיד תַּחֲזִינָה and יֵצֵא respectively.

5. Note Paseḵ after לִבִּי. Read תַּצְפֹּר, תַּבְחוּן; the imperf. is more natural. M's צִרְפַּתִּי is an expansion of צִרְפַּת, which is a correct alternative reading to פָּקַדְתָּ. Cp. Job vii. 18, where read תַּצְרִפְנִי (see on viii. 5). We have already referred to לִלְלָה, which is against parallelism. A writer in *Journ. of Sacred Lit.*, n.s., iv. 340, proposes כְּלִיֹּת (|| לֹב). But this is insufficient. Read כְּלִיֹּתִי (Gr.); this was written 'כְּלִיֹּת'. The same corruption occurs in xvi. 7 and (see on lxxvii. 7) Job xxxv. 10b.

In l. 6 (end of v. 3) M's זִפְתִּי, which Kön. (ii. 518, n. 3; *Synt.* § 231a) accepts. Most (e.g. Dathe, Hu., Per., Bi., Bt.) prefer זִפְתִּי or זִפְתִּי; cp. G 'A 3 J S T (alt.). But זִפְתָּה, 'wicked plan,' does not suit the context, which rather suggests מִרְמָה. ז and ת, ר and מ are regularly

confounded.—M בלי־עבר פי. This might be post-Biblical Hebrew (*Yoma*, 86a, עָבַר עֲבָרָה, 'he trespassed a trespass'; cp. *OP*, 466). The whole phrase must be corrupt. פי will be accounted for presently. For בלי־עבר read בְּלִפְי אֵין [אֵין] און and מרמה און are parallel (xxxvi. 4).

7 f. M בְּדִבֵּר שְׁפָתֶיךָ; G presupposes בדברי. M's reading is inadequately defended by cxix. 13. The parallel line suggests מִדְּרָכִי; in fact, דִּבֵּר and דָּרַךְ are frequently confounded (see e.g. xxxix. 2). For שְׁפָתֶיךָ we expect either a class-name or an ethnic. Since אָדָם should presumably be read אָדָם (xii. 2, xiv. 2), 'ש' should probably be צָרְפָת; Edom (or Aram = Jerahmeel?) and Zarephath were practically synonymous. See xlv. 17a, where 'Zarephath' and 'Gebal' appear to be combined. Cp. 'Zarephath' in *Enc. Bib.* Duhm proposes to read לִפְעֻלָּתְךָ אָדָם, 'deinem Thun schweige ich.' But if a verb were wanted, we should expect a phrase like כָּלֵאתִי רְגְלִי (cxix. 101, Prov. i. 15). מִמְּעַנְלוֹת לִפְ not improbably comes from פִּי. The second מ became נ; the first is represented by פִּי at the end of v. 3. לִ is ditto-graphic. Passing on, אֲנִי is an imperfectly written אֲדָנִי. It has produced the omission of נ in נִשְׁמַרְתִּי (so we should read with Wellh.; in Josh. vi. 18 read הִשְׁמַרְנוּ). Continue מֵאַרְחוֹת (S, Bā., Gr., We.). On פָּרִיץ see exeg. note.

9 f. Read תִּמְכּוּ; the descriptive infin. is not in place (see xxxv. 16). In L 10 (end) insert בִּדְרִכֶּיךָ (metre and parallelism), with Bickell.

In L 11 the changes אֲדָנִי and אֱלִי are too simple to need defence. But in L 13 we have to use our methods boldly, if we would not unduly disparage the capacities of the psalmist. The clever translator Street reads חָסִי בָּךְ = חֲסִיד. G has τοὺς ἐλπίζοντας ἐπὶ σε (similarly S). These are petty expedients. A perfect cure can only be effected by a remedy based on a wide experience of the ways of the scribes. For 'ח מוֹשִׁיעַ read בְּמִקְדֵּשְׁךָ. Obviously חֲסִידֶיךָ should be חֲסִידֶיךָ. For L 14 M gives us material which needs careful critical handling. As it stands, no reasonable exegesis is possible. Beyond doubt, the passage must be taken together with xvi. 11 (see below, on L 30). מִמִּים בִּימִי is parallel to the false reading נַעֲמֹת בִּימִי ('pleasant things in thy right hand!'), and both readings spring from מִמַּתְקוֹ; בְּמִשְׁכַּנְתֶּיךָ = מִמַּתְקוֹ (מ = נו; פ = ק; צ = ת). Cp. xxvii. 5.—In L 15 כָּאִישׁוֹן בְּתִעֵן is too short, and is not favoured by parallelism. עֵין comes from בְּחֻצֹת בֵּיתְךָ, and belongs to L 15a; בֵּת כְּאִי is a distortion of בֵּיתְךָ. In L 17 זֶן שְׂדוּנִי is hardly tolerable. Aramaisms are not, as a rule, probable, but here שְׂדוּנִי at once suggests itself. L 18 should perhaps be בְּנִפְשׁ אִיבִי אֶל־תִּתְּנִי. Cp. xxvii. 12.

In *l.* 19 we have to combine material from *v.* 9 (end) and *v.* 10 (beg.). Robertson Smith (*Rel. Sem.*<sup>(2)</sup>, 379) thought that a particular part of the *viscera* was meant (Ar. *hלב*). But would חלב, 'midriff,' have been used side by side with כֶּבֶד, 'liver,' as the seat of the feelings? Duhm (after Dys.) would read חלב לבמו, 'their heart is become fat,' continuing סָנְרוּ פִימָה; not satisfactory. חלבמו should be חֲבִלֵי מוֹת (? חבלי); see xviii. 6, on which our passage is dependent.—20. Read, to match *l.* 19, שִׁבְלֵי יָמִים יִבְעֲתוּנִי; cp. xviii. 5, lxi. 3. The correction is justified by sound method. דברו probably comes from a dittographed fragment of שבלי.—21. M אֲשֶׁרנִי עֲתָה סִבְבֹּנִי. What can אש' mean? 'At each of our steps'? Surely this is superfluous, nor does it suit. If, however, we grant that the enemies referred to in the neighbouring psalms are the N. Arabian peoples, and that a name for one of these peoples was גִּשּׁוּר (often written אשור = אשחור), we shall at once be disposed to correct אֲשֶׁרנִי into גִּשְׁרִים. G, ἐκβάλλοντες or ἐκβαλόντες, i.e. perhaps גִּרְשׁוּנִי [גִּשְׁוִי] עֲתָה is also suspicious. Read perhaps סִבְבֹּנִי [כִּי] גִּשְׁוִי, and compare xxii. 17. The alternative to גִּשְׁוִי is

(cp. אנש' from יש', lvi. 2, crit. n.). רשעים would be too vague.—The material supplied in M for *l.* 22 is again full of corruption, which Grätz, Nestle, Wildeboer (*ZATW*, 1896, p. 323; 1897, p. 180), and Duhm have treated somewhat too superficially. We may expect to find another allusion to the true text of Ps. xxii., where the N. Arabian oppressors are most probably described (*v.* 13, 17) both as 'lions' and as 'wild oxen with pointed horns.' If so, read בִּקְרָנֵי הַשָּׁן כְּתִתּוּנִי. For see next note.

In *l.* 23 for דִּמְיוֹנִי (G ὑπελάβουν με, דִּמְיוֹנִי) read certainly יִקְדְּמוּנִי (cp. xviii. 6, 10); see below. ק is represented by צ in בארץ (see on *l.* 22); באר comes from כאר [י], 'as a lion,' written too soon.

In *l.* 24 for יִכְסֹף read probably יִשְׁקֹד (cp. Jer. v. 6). Kennedy's clever and plausible reading יִשְׁקִיף would mean, not 'look out,' but 'look down.' Point לִטְרָף (Gr.), and insert יִקְפּוּנִי, which easily fell out before כִּכְפִּיר. It was replaced in the margin, and now appears in M, corrupt and mutilated, as פָּנוֹי. קדמה, which precedes it, represents יִקְדְּמוּנִי (a correction of דִּמְיוֹנִי). To read יִשָּׁר for יִשָּׁב (cp. יִשָּׁר for יִשָּׁב in x. 8) would only be possible if שֹׁר ever meant 'to lie in wait' (see Ges.-Buhl).

In *l.* 25 read וְהִכְרִיעֵהוּ; in *l.* 27, for the impossible מִרְשַׁע חֲרָבָד read probably מִרְשַׁע כְּפָרִים (cp. on xxxiv. 11). כִּפְרִים is also possible; in xxii. 21 כִּפִּיר has become חֲרָב.

We now encounter one of our greatest textual problems. מִמָּתִים יִדָּר must be corrupt, but only a weak critic would add 'hopelessly.' יִדָּר.



like **ידי** in lxxvii. 3, probably comes from **יהוה**. Then comes the ditto-gram **מחלד**, and the extraordinary group of characters—**חלקם בחיים**. The key to the latter exists in Job (see xx. 23). The true text runs, **תַּמְתֵּר עֲלֵיהֶם גְּחָלִים**; in Job, *l.c.* **בלחמו** should certainly be **גְּחָלִים**. Errors constantly arise both through the transposition of letters and through the substitution of similar or kindred letters. Thus **מחלד** = **עליהם**, and **חלקם** = **גְּחָלִים**. Still stranger but only a little less certain examples of this follow. **בַּחַיִּים וְצַפִּינָה** (וצפונד) should most probably be **וְרִיחַ פְּלִצִּית** (see on xi. 6). Thus we get a parallel for **גְּחָלִים**. **תמלא בטנו** is correct (see Job xx. 23). **שבעו** is superfluous both for sense and for metre. Most probably it comes from **אשבעה**, which was written too soon, through the scribe's eye glancing at what is here reckoned as line 30.

In the closing couplet, *ll.* 29, 30 (= *v.* 15), read **בצדקך**; **ך** fell out after **ק**. Not so easily corrected is the very doubtful **תְּמוֹנֶתְךָ**. Resuming our consideration of this (see exeg. note) we may remark that it would not be unnatural to transfer **נַעֲמוֹת בִּימִינְךָ** from xvi. 11 (where it is metrically superfluous) to xvii. 15, supposing a *lapsus oculi* on the part of the scribe. But the expression is by no means natural. Certainly the theory of *lapsus oculi* will most easily account for the existence of these words ('נַעֲמוֹת בִּימִינְךָ') at the end of xvi. 11, but the further problem remains to discover the word, or the words, out of which the improbable phrase referred to, and also the equally false parallel reading may have arisen. There is only one possible solution,

still remains. Beyond doubt this has arisen out of **חֲסִדְךָ**. The decisive proof is that **חֲסִדְךָ** is the only word out of which the troublesome **נַעֲמוֹת** at the end of xvi. 11 can have arisen.

## PSALM XVIII.

THE whole psalm is in trimeters, which are disposed in stanzas of eight lines each. Originally it was shorter; stanzas 3-5 are a later insertion,<sup>1</sup> which may, however, be due to the author of the original poem, for it is a fine specimen of this class of compositions, and the want of a theophany would at once have been seen to be adverse to the popularity of the work (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Theophany'); it is moreover in the same metre as the original poem. The first critical question relates to the speaker of the poem. One might very naturally regard the psalm as a 'dramatic lyric,' and suppose David to be the speaker, the exaggerations being viewed as having the character of virtual Messianic predictions (cp. *OP*, 206). This is the theory expressed in the liturgical appendix (*v.* 51, unless *c.* is a later addition), but is hardly correct. From the bold assertion of legal righteousness and from the Deuteronomistic phraseology it is plain that the pious community is the speaker. With the imaginative licence of faith, righteous Israel looks back

<sup>1</sup> Hupfeld and the present writer (see *OP*, 205, 223) have both entertained the idea of the composite origin of the psalm. The view here adopted, however, is due to Löhr (see his commentary on 2 S. xxii.).

upon its completed discipline, and gives thanks for the divine loving-kindness, and for the reward apportioned to it. The poet is an ardent monotheist (*v.* 32), and a strict adherent of the doctrine of retribution, in connection with the Messianic belief in its wider form.

How greatly exegesis is the gainer from a more courageous and methodical treatment of textual problems, hardly needs to be stated. It would be difficult to deny that stanza 4 (*v.* 11-13) has been relieved of much obscurity and incoherence. Many other flaws (see *e.g.* *ll.* 52, 61 f., 91 f., 96, 101) in this artificial but certainly not contemptible poem have, we may hope, been removed, and the recovery of references to the Jerahmeelites and N. Arabians (a general term) in stanzas 1, 9, 13, 14 is an important element in the parallelism which critical exegesis reveals between the second part of Ps. xviii. and Ps. ii.

The Davidic origin of Ps. xviii. has been thought to be guaranteed by the existence of a second recension of the psalm in 2 S. xxii. This chapter however, together with the *māshāl* in xxiii. 1-7, probably forms the latest addition to the Books of Samuel, and no weight can be attached to the argument which Baethgen and others have based upon it. The closing verse both in 2 S. xxii. and in Ps. xviii., which refers to Yahwē's anointed king and to David and his posterity, is a late liturgical appendix (*c.* indeed may be an appendix to the appendix), and the title of the psalm which represents it as David's song of thanksgiving for his deliverance out of the hand (כַּף) of all his enemies and out of the hand (יָד) of

Saul, has reached its present form through editorial manipulation of an already corrupt text under the influence of a faulty theory. The true text of the psalm (when emended according to the analogy of other titles) does not refer at all to David.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the appearances of a pre-exilic (even though not Davidic) origin<sup>2</sup> are altogether illusory. The idealistic religious and political outlook in *v.* 32, 44, 50, the Deuteronomic view of the 'covenant' in *v.* 21-28, the Deuteronomic expressions in 22-24, and the points of contact with Dt. xxxii., xxxiii., exclude such an origin for our psalm. For it took time for the ideas and language of Deuteronomy (which, moreover, is no longer in its original form) to affect religious literature. The psalm, however, must be earlier than Pss. cxvi. (*v.* 3 f.) and cxliv. (1 f., 6 f., 10), Prov. xxx. (*v.* 5), and Hab. iii. (*v.* 19), which, at any rate in their present form, are dependent upon it.

[The points of contact with Dt. xxxii., xxxiii., are *v.* 10, 11, 32, *cp.* Dt. xxxiii. 26; *v.* 12, *cp.* Dt. xxxii. 11; *v.* 31, *cp.* Dt. xxxii. 4 (Prov. xxx. 5); *v.* 32 (צָרָה, a divine title), *cp.* Dt. xxxii. 4, 15, 18, 30 f., 37 (Is. xlv. 8, 1 S. ii. 2); *v.* 32 (Eloah), Dt. xxxii. 15, 17; *v.* 32 (idea), Dt. xxxii. 39a (Is. xlv. 5a). The parallelism between *v.* 44 and Is. lv. 4 f. is of slight importance, for most probably Is. lv. 3-5 is a very late insertion, made after Ps. xviii. had become misinterpreted as a triumphal ode of David.]

According to Duhm, a more precise date can be assigned. He connects this as well as other psalms with the history of Alexander Jannæus, who had a strong interest in asserting his strict legal righteousness against his Pharisean enemies. *Vv.* 5-7 are supposed by Duhm to describe Alexander's defeat at Asophon or Gadara. It is very improbable, however, that any individual is referred to. The claim of warlike ability is not more surprising in this psalm than in Ps. ii. 9 and cxlix. 6 (see on these psalms), and the bitterness towards the Edomites was perennial, while the loud assertions of innocence are most intelligible (see above) in the mouth of the community.

We spoke of a second 'recension' of the psalm in 2 S. xxii. Certain MSS. of G in 2 S. xxii. (see on *ll.* 19, 82, 93, 108 of our version) do in fact appear to represent a peculiar recension based on a somewhat different Hebrew text from that implied by the ordinary Greek text, which both in 2 S. and in Ps. inclines on the whole to M's text of Ps. xviii. Subtle speculations as to the origin and relation of the two Hebrew texts (2 S. and Ps.) are hardly called for. See further Baethgen, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1882, pp. 605 ff.; Ley, *Leitfaden*, 41 f.; H. P. Smith, *Samuel* (on 2 S. xxii.), and *Presbyterian Review*, 1885, pp. 630 f.; W. H. Bennett, *Hebraica*, 1887, pp. 65-86; König, *Einleitung*, pp. 401 f.; Sievers, *Metr. Stud.* ii. 515 ff. *Cp.* also Joel Müller, *Massehet Soferim* (1878), pp. 115 f.

<sup>1</sup> See 'Psalms,' *Enc. Bib.*, § 45; *cp.* § 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Cp.* *OP*, 204-207.

*Deposited : of 'Arab-ethan. The words of Israel in the day that Yahwè delivers him from the hand of all the Arabians and from Ishmael.*

- 1 I will extol thee, O Yahwè ! +source of+ my righteousness, 2  
 My rock, my fortress, mine asylum, 3  
 God who art my strength, in whom I take refuge,  
 My shield, my horn of victory,  
 My sure retreat, my shelter, my stronghold, .  
 Who deliverest me from the men of Cusham.  
 Who can utter the righteous acts of Yahwè, , 4  
 Or who recount his deliverances ?
- The floods of Deathland had snatched me away, 5  
 10 The billows of Ruinland had overwhelmed me,  
 The snares of Sheol had encompassed me, 6  
 The toils of Gloomland had come against me.  
 In my distress I called upon Yahwè, 7  
 I cried +for help+ unto my God ;  
 He heard my voice from his palace,  
 My cry reached his ears. .

*Later insertion (ll. 17—40).*

- He threatened, and the earth did rock, 8  
 The foundations of the mountains trembled,  
 They swayed to and fro, because he was wroth ;  
 20 Smoke went up from his nostrils, 9  
 Fire from his mouth devoured,  
 Glowing coals flashed forth from it.  
 He bowed the heavens and came down, 10  
 While a mass of clouds was under his feet.
- He mounted the cherub, and flew ; 11  
 He came swooping on the wings of the wind ;  
 Darkness he made his minister, 12  
 The clouds [of heaven] his angels ;  
 His quiver [he prepared in] the heaven,  
 30 [And his bow in] the clouds of the sky ;  
 From before him passed his servants— 13  
 Hail and burning coals.

In heaven Yahwè thundered, 14  
 The Most High sounded with his voice<sup>1</sup> ;  
 His arrows ~~he~~ shot, he scattered them, 15  
 Lightnings he hurled, and affrighted them.  
 The ocean-channels came into view, 16  
 The world's foundations were laid bare—  
 At thy threatening, O Yahwè,  
 40 At the violent blast of thy nostrils.

\*

• He reached from high heaven and grasped me, 17  
 He drew me out of the vast waters ;  
 He snatched me from an enemy too strong, 18  
 From haters too mighty for me ;  
 They came upon me in the day when I faltered, 19  
 But Yahwè proved my support.  
 He brought me forth into an open space, 20  
 He rescued me, because he took pleasure in me.

In proportion to my righteousness Yahwè dealt with me, 21  
 50 In proportion to the purity of my hands he requited me,  
 Because I observed the ways of Yahwè, 22  
 And did not forsake his paths,  
 For all his ordinances were +constantly+ before me, 23  
 And I turned not aside from his statutes ;  
 So I was loyal toward him, 24  
 From guilty acts I kept myself.

And Yahwè requited me in proportion to my righteousness, 25  
 In proportion to the purity of my hands which he saw.  
 Towards the covenant-keeper thou showest thyself a  
 covenant-keeper, 26  
 60 Towards the loyal one thou showest thyself loyal ;  
 But towards the violent one thou showest thyself violent, 27  
 And towards the proud thou showest thyself more than  
 man.

Yea, it is thine to deliver a humble people, 28  
 But the eyes of all haughty ones thou art wont to abase.

Yea, thou<sup>2</sup> art my lamp, O Yahwè ! 29  
 My God illumines my darkness.  
 Yea, with thee I can break Jerahmeel, 30  
 With my God I can divide Geshur.

<sup>1</sup> Hail and burning coals.

<sup>2</sup> Lightest.

- God ! flawless [is his work] ! 31
- 70 [Right are all] his ways !  
 Well-tried is Yahwè's promise,  
 A shield is he to all that take refuge in him !
- Yea, who is God except Yahwè ? 32  
 Or who is a Rock save our God ?  
 The God that bound me about with strength, 33  
 And girded my loins with heroic might,  
 That gave me feet like the hinds, 34  
 And enabled me to stand on heights,  
 That trained my hands for battle, 35
- 80 And mine arms to +use+ a bow of bronze.  
 Yea, thou gavest me thy succouring shield, 36  
 Thy helping right hand sustained me ;  
 Thou madest broad my steps where I went, 37  
 Mine ancles faltered not.  
 I pursued mine enemies and overtook them ; 38  
 And turned not until I had destroyed them ;  
 I struck them so that they could not rise, 39  
 But fell under my feet.
- Thou didst gird me with strength for battle, 40
- 90 Thou didst bow down mine assailants under me.  
 Thou didst give me mine enemies as a prey, 41  
 My right hand seized my haters.  
 They cried, but there was none to deliver ; 42  
 +Cried+ unto Yahwè, but he answered them not.  
 I beat them as small as the dust of the market-place, 43  
 I swept them away as the mire of the streets.
- Thou didst deliver me from the folk of the Arabians, 44a  
 Thou didst rescue me from the men of Cusham ; 49c  
 Thou madest me the head of the nations, 44b
- 100 People whom I knew not became my servants. 44c  
 The sons of Gebal sought me eagerly ; 45b  
 The Ishmaelites became obedient unto me ; 45a  
 They brought frankincense and gold, 46  
 The Geshurites presented choice gold.
- Praised and blessed be my Rock, 47  
 Exalted be God my deliverer,  
 The God that granted me full revenge, 48  
 And crushed peoples under me,

That rescued me from the [people of the] Arabians, 49a  
 110 That preserved me from Jerahmeel. 49b  
 Therefore I will give thanks unto thee among the nations, 50  
 To thy name, O Yahwè! I will chant hymns.<sup>1</sup>

2. **Mine asylum.** The speaker has been in as much danger as if he were followed by the avenger of blood.—4. *My horn.* Cp. lxxxix. 18.—7 f. Imitated in cvi. 2. *Cusham*, i.e. the N. Arabian Cush (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Cush,' 2), see l. 98.

9—12. He has sunk (in a figure) into the ocean whose waters bathe the foundations of the world (xxiv. 2), and bound the vast city of the dead on every side. The expression, 'the floods of Deathland' (= Sheol), and the parallel phrases are figurative; the psalmist means 'the men of Cusham' (l. 6), i.e. the N. Arabian oppressors (cp. on xvii. 10, lxix. 3—5, lxxxviii. 17). The basis of the expression is derived from Babylonian mythology—'Even if, O Gilgames, thou didst cross the sea, what wouldest thou do on arriving at the waters of death,' are the words of the goddess Sabitu to Gilgames, who is on his way to the hero of the Deluge in Paradise (Jeremias, *Vorstellungen*, 86 f.; Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.*, 585). Surely in a mythological text *mê mûti* means more than merely 'destructive waters' (Jensen).—*Ruin-land.* The second of the four names of the underworld, mentioned again (certainly) in Isa. xxxviii. 17 ('the pit of Ruin-land,' reading בליעל for בלי). Belyya'al ('Belial') may be a Hebraized form (involving a popular etymology, 'one comes not up again') of Bilili, the non-Semitic Babylonian name of the goddess of the underworld and of vegetation. Unlike Tammuz, Bilili 'appears to be unable to come forth again from the world of the dead' (Jensen, *Exp. Times*, ix. 41). Another name for the goddess of the underworld was Allatu, and we gather from Clermont Ganneau's bronze plaque (see Maspero, *Dawn*, 691) that Allatu was conceived of as a monster. Very possibly בליעל was popularly derived

from בלע, 'to swallow up'; thus perhaps we may account for the ע in בליעל (cp. König's remark on the insertion of ע in the names of animals as a 'determinative,' *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 402).

Thus too we see how בליעל (in 'sons of Belial') might come to mean 'destructiveness,' or the like. It will be noticed that the נחלי ('rivers of') of M has become נלי, 'billows of,' in our revised text (see crit. note). The objection made to the most probable explanation of our passage on the ground that Bab. mythology does not know of a river Styx, is, therefore, pointless. Duhm, who renders 'die Bäche des Untergangs,' certainly does not hit the poet's meaning. See further 'Belial,' *Enc. Bib.*, and (on 'Bilili') Jensen, *Kosmol.*, 225, 275.

17—24. Duhm is severe upon this description of a theophany; the lavish imagery, he says, is disproportionate to the final result, which is merely the deliverance of a Jewish warrior. How can this be admitted? Rhetoric no doubt there is; imitation of 'older passages' (hardly Jer. xvii. 4, Isa. lxxv. 5, but rather Ex. xix. 16 ff., xx. 18, Isa. xxix. 6) no doubt there is; but the grandiose character of the description is not in excess of the occasion, which is the final deliverance of Israel with the Messiah at its head. In reality, the whole passage is a reflexion of an older mythology; the later parts (e.g. xix. 2—7, and Job) delight in these archaic revivals. Have they not a right to their taste?

25 f. **The cherub**, || 'the wings of the wind.' Probably the poet identifies the cherub with the storm-wind; cp. civ. 3, Isa. xix. 1. So Ninib (Adar) is called *rakib abûbi*, 'he who rides on the tempest' (Del. *Ass. HWB*, 4a). See 'Cherub,' *Enc.*

<sup>1</sup> That gives great victories unto his king,  
 That shows lovingkindness unto his anointed,  
 Unto David and unto his offspring for ever.

*Bib.*; Smythe-Palmer, *Nineteenth Century*, Jan., 1901, p. 341. Lines 25-28 and 31 f. are imitated in civ. 3 f.

29 f. **His quiver, his bow.** Cp. lxxvii. 18, Lam. iii. 13, Hab. iii. 9, 11.—31 f. *His servants.* Cp. 27 f.; Eccus. xxxix. 29, 31.—39. נַעֲרָה. Cp. civ. 7.

41. Cp. lvii. 4.—42. For the figure cp. lines 9 f., lxix. 2 f.

47. *He brought me forth, &c.* Cp. xxv. 17, cxlii. 8, cxliii. 11.—*Because, &c.* Cp. xxii. 9, xli. 12. Thus the poet leads on to the colossal self-assertion which follows.

49 f. The help given to the speaker is the reward of his righteousness (l. 49); Yahwè too is righteous—He deals with every one in exact accordance with his deserts (l. 50). This is the two-fold theme of ll. 50-58 and ll. 59-62. Cp. vii. 9; xvii. 1-5.

51-54. Note the Deuteronomic phrases דְּקוֹת, כָּל-מִשְׁפָּטִים, שָׁמַר. לֹא-אֶסּוּר מִפְּנֵה in 2 S. xxii. 23 is also Deuteronomic (2 K. iii. 3, xiii. 2, 6, x. 29, 31); see crit. note.

59 f. חֶסֶד, implying that חֶסֶד is the bond of the covenant; cp. 'Lovingkindness,' *Enc. Bib.* Even Yahwè therefore can be called חֶסֶד; cp. cxlv. 17, Jer. iii. 12. 'Liebreich' (Ol.) is a misleading rendering.—תָּמִים, not here 'flawless' (as l. 69), but 'entirely devoted' (as l. 55), חֶסֶד.

61 f. גִּבּוֹר, 'tyrant,' in a bad sense, as lii. 3. Its natural parallel is עֲתָק; the proud speech of oppressors is specially meant (xxx. 19, lxxv. 6, xciv. 4, 2 S. ii. 3).—תַּתְּפֹּלָא (see crit. note); cp. Isa. xxix. 14. It is one of the chief gains of strict criticism that we are no longer obliged to excuse the language of the Psalmist as that of the 'natural man' (Ol.). There is no parallel to the daring statement of M elsewhere.

63 f. Observe that עָנִי (= עָנִי) represents ll. 59 f.; while רַמִּים re<sub>1</sub>

corresponds to ll. 61 f., and supports the correction עֲתָק in l. 62. עָנִי, as Zeph. iii. 12; cp. on ix. 13.

69-72. See Dt. xxxii. 4, Prov. xxx. 5, and cp. on xii. 7.

73 f. **Who is God, &c.** Cp. 1 S. ii. 2, 2 S. vii. 22, and especially Isa. xlv. 8. We can hardly lay stress on אֱלֹהִי (v. 31a), as proving the late

date of the Psalm. For though may be a late, artificial formation from אֱלֹהִים (references in Ges.-Bu.), yet we cannot be sure that both here and in Isa. xlv. 8 אֱלֹהִי may not have been substituted for אֵל, which word is here read by 2 S. See further 'Names of God,' *Enc. Bib.—A Rock*, צִיֵּר; so v. 47; cp. Dt. xxxii. 31. G, Θεός, which is a correct paraphrase.

75 ff. Cp. the triumphal hymn of Thotmes III. (Brugsch, *Hist. of Eg.*, i. 370 ff.), where in ten strophes the god Amen describes the victories of the king, and ascribes them to himself ('I came, and thou smotest . . .') In the sanctuary of the temple of Thotmes III. at Karnak, the god Set of Nub teaches his royal pupil to shoot with the bow (Baedeker, *Upper Egypt*, 140). This illustrates ll. 79 f.

77 f. Found again, with two variations, in Hab. iii. 19.—*Like hinds.* Cp. 2 S. ii. 18, 1 Chr. xii. 8.

79 f. Cp. cxliv. 1. This explains the warlike ability ascribed to pious Israel in cxlix. 6 f., ii. 9 (?).

83. **Thou madest broad, &c.,** i.e. gavest me strength to step out (cp. Isa. lxiii. 1). So Job xviii. 7.—85. The 'enemies' are primarily the N. Arabian oppressors, as ll. 97 ff. show; the title of the Psalm is perfectly right.

87. **I struck them, &c.** Cp. ii. 9 (and note).

89. Nearly a repetition of l. 75. So l. 90 virtually repeats l. 88.

94. **Unto Yahwè,** i.e. for pity. Duhm, however, thinks of the internal strife of the Jews under Alexander Jannæus.

97 f. **The Arabians and the men of Cusham** (nearly = Jerah-

meel) are here, as elsewhere, the chief enemies of the Jews in the age of the Psalter. Cp. lxxvi. 19 (corr. text), where the 'remnant of Maacah,' it is said, will bow down to Yahwē.

101. **Sought me eagerly.** Cp. Isa. lv. 5. How unworthy the text-reading ('gave feigned submission') is, need not be shown at length. See crit. note. Though the psalmist uses the conventional language of oriental imperialists (cp. Sargon's inscriptions), he really cherishes the hope that not a few belonging to the conquered nations

will submit to the true God. Cp. ii. 10-12, and specially lix., ll. 21-24, lxxxiii., ll. 32-36.

103 f. Cp. lxxviii. 31 and lxxii. 10 (corr. text); Isa. lx. 6. The *chains* are link-chains (Ar. *si/sūlah*).

105. מְהִלָּל; xlvi. 2, xcvi. 4, cxlv. 3.

111. **Among the nations**, i.e. in the outer circle of nations—those which had not been hostile to Israel. Cp. Isa. lxvi. 19.

**Critical Notes.** Title. On לעֲבַד יְהוָה (cp. xxxvi.), see Introd. The second part has been thoroughly disguised by a later writer. The differences in form in the Psalter and in 2 Sam. are unimportant, with the exception of the last; מִיד has been altered in 2 S. into כֹּמֶפֶה for the sake of uniformity. The warning Paseḵs in M, after דָּבָר and after בְּיוֹם should be noticed. To restore a true historical colour, on the analogy of the restored title of Ps. vii., read דְּבַרִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיוֹם הַצִּיל יְהוָה אוֹתוֹ מִכַּף כָּל-עֲרִבִים וּמִיִּשְׁמַעְאֵל לְדוֹר. It may be admitted that the writer has very cleverly adapted the (indistinctly written) title to the corrupted prefix לְדוֹר. M. Heilprin ingeniously suggests שְׁאוֹל (Sheol); cp. vi. 5, 6.

1. M אֶרְחֶמֶךָ. The Vss. confirm this, but the context does not favour it. Even apart from this, 'I love thee' needs to be followed by 'with all my heart.' And, as the decisive argument, רָחַם, 'to love,' is Aram. (cp. Ass. *rāmu*), not Heb.; see S. נ and ח are confounded. The וִיאֲמַר of 2 Sam. should put us on the right track; it springs from (xxx. 2). This is read by Ol., Hi., Dy., Bi., Gr.—2 S. omits

וְ, or rather צִדְקִי (see on xvii. 1). As a title of God חֲזָקִי or חֲזָקִי (?) is unexampled. צִדְקִי is natural, because it expresses the leading idea of the psalm. Cp. on cxliv. 2.

2. Omit the dittographed יְהוָה.—M מִפְּלִטִי; 2 S. מִפְּלִט לִי; cp. cxliv. 2. Rather, as Del. (note) and Duhm, מִפְּלִטִי. Cp. lv. 9, also Cant. iv. 4, where תַּלְפִּיּוֹת has grown out of ט

3. M אֱלֹהֵי צוּרִי; 2 S. אֱלֹהֵי צִ'. Read אֱלֹהֵי עֲזִי and confounded (see on xxviii. 8).

5 f. Insert וּמִנּוּסִים וּמִעֲזֵי מֵאִישׁ כָּשֶׁם תִּשְׁעֲנִי. See partly 2 S. The eight-line stanza requires such an insertion. For מֵאִישׁ, cp. l. 110. The of 2 S. represents both מֵאִישׁ and מִעֲזֵי; it is conflate. For cp. l. 98.



7 f. M **מְהִלֵּל אֶקְרָא**; none of the rival explanations (see Ol., Now., Bā., Du.) can make this appear natural. Read almost certainly, **מִי** **וּמִן־אֵיבֵי יְשׁוּעָתִי**, and continue, **וּמִן־אֵיבֵי יְהוָה**, and **יְמַלֵּל צְדָקוֹת יְהוָה**, and **אֲשׁוּעַ** would be just plausible enough to escape censure, if we had not the corrected text of *l.* 7 to guide us. It is, however, not free from exegetical difficulty. The historic presents (Kön.) also are not natural. Nor can **מִן־אֵיבֵי**, in a passage which is otherwise suspicious, be passed over without question. **מִן** is indeed defensible before **א** (in prose, it often occurs before the article), but it should be noted that **מִן** in *v.* 14,<sup>2</sup> 2 S., and in *v.* 49 M, is corrupt.

9. M **אֶפְפוֹנֵי חֲבִלֵי יְמוֹת**. 2 S. needlessly prefixes **כִּי**; it also attests **אֶפְפוֹנֵי**. Yet this is certainly wrong. True, **אֶפֶף** occurs again in M of cxvi. 3, Jon. ii. 5, but both expressions are based on the present passage; and in M of xl. 13, which is also obviously imitative. It is very probable that all these passages have been harmonized. This leaves but one real witness for **אֶפֶף**—a word without any clear linguistic affinities. G reads differently—*περιέσχον με*, *i.e.* perhaps **הִקְפוֹנִי** (cp. G xxii. 17), in both psalm-passages (but *περιεχύθη* in Jon.). More probably right is **סְפוֹנֵי**. **חֲבִלֵי** too is corrupt (see *l.* 11) in spite of cxvi. 3. Most prefer the variant **מִשְׁבְּרֵי** of 2 S., which is supposed to mean ‘breakers.’ M gives this word again in xlii. 8, lxxxviii. 8, xciii. 4 (G everywhere

. But the sense is a very odd one; the only certain sense of is *matrix*, ‘the mouth of the womb’ (2 K. xix. 3, Isa. xxxvii. 3, Hos xiii. 13). Corruption must be assumed; probably we should read **שְׁבִילֵי**,<sup>1</sup> which became corrupted into **שְׁבִרֵי**. The prefixed **מ** is clearly dittographic in xciii. 4, and hardly less plainly in 2 S., where the preceding **נִי**, as often, was mistaken for **מ**. Of this prefixed **מ** the initial **ח** in (M of Ps.) is a corruption; **ש** fell out. Cp. on xl. 13, xlii. 8. For in *l.* 9 Klo. prefers **מִים** (Luc. in 2 S. *ὑδρα*), but against the parallelism.

10. M **נַחְלֵי בְּלִיעַל יִבְעֵתִי**. **נַחְלִים**, like **נַהֲרוֹת** (xxiv. 2), might mean the ocean-streams. Still it is more natural to read **נָחַלִּי** (xlii. 8<sup>(2)</sup>—lxv. 8, &c.). This was probably corrupted first into **נַחְלִי** (cp. *v.* 9, 14), and then into **נַחְלֵי**; see a parallel in cxxiv. 4. **יִבְעֵתִי** (which might suggest **בְּלַהוֹת** for **בְּלִיעַל**) is not favoured by parallelism. Read probably **שְׁטַפוֹנֵי** (cp. lxix. 3); **ש = ע, ט = ת, פ = ב**.—12. M **מָוֶת**. Read probably **צַלְמוֹת** (see note above). Thus we get four names for the nether world.

16. M G here insert **לִפְנֵי** (weak variant to **בְּאֵז**). 2 S. is without **לִי**.

<sup>1</sup> Accidentally not found in M in the sense of ‘floods.’

17 f. For 'ויתגעש read וינער (Nestle, *Marg.* 21). 2 S., Kr., ויתגעש; Luc. ἐπέβλεψε.

27 f. This and the next line are not very clear or suitable. 2 S. and G (Ps. and Sam.) suggest וישת (so Gr.), but that is a trifle. Should not סביבותיו be משרתו (civ. 4)? Cp. משרת in xci. 1. משרתו seems to have arisen partly out of a dittographed משרתו, partly out of עביו. סכתו is a corruption of מלאכיו. Read as l. 28, עביו שמים 'מר. This fits the context.

29. M חשבתמים, hardly probable after חשך in l. 27. In 2 S. 'חשרת מ', 'a sifting (= sprinkling) of water;' a post-Biblical root and sense\* (חשרים, 1 K. vii. 33, is corrupt). Read probably יכין אשפתו בשמים. Note the reference to arrows in l. 35, and cp. Hab. iii. 9, 11. The loss of matter here in M is not so great as that in the next two lines in M of 2 S.—M's עביו שחקים is a fragment of the line, וקשתו בעביו. עביו שחקים may easily have been lost through its resemblance to סכתו and חשבת. Bā. and We., with 'ΑΣ (ἐν παχύτητι) point עביו, 'thickness (of)'; but this does not help. G, ἐν νεφέλαις, in 2 S. also ἐπάχυνεν, a doublet.

31 f. M מנגדו עבדיו עביו עברו. Read certainly מנגדו עבדיו עביו. נגדו is a miswritten עבדיו. Cp. ll. 12 f. 2 S. omits עביו and עברו, and reads בערו for עברו, with the assent of Street (1790) and Woods (*Hebraica*, '87, p. 262). Du., following Bi., reads עביו שחקים מנגדו, 'a thicket of clouds without brightness.'

33 f. 2 S. reads מן-שמים. This can be accounted for. מ is dittographed; נ comes from ב. Cp. on l. 7 f.—Omit נחלי אש (G).

36. Read וברקים ברק, combining M here and in 2 S.; or וברק וברק. G in 2 S. has καὶ ἡστραψεν ἀστραπήν; cp. cxliv. 6. M's רב (in Ps.) cannot be defended by Gen. xlix. 23, where רבו is a fragment of וירבהו. רב is clearly a fragment of ברק. Cp. Ass. *baraku*, 'to flash.' So Bennett, Klo., Bā., Kau.

37. M מים; 2 S. ים (so Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Bā., Gunkel). Read perhaps ימים (Gr., Klo.).

43. M עו. Read כיעו (T, Klo.). Neither of the views given by Bā. is satisfactory; cp. Kön., *Synt.*, §§ 277<sup>h</sup>, n. <sup>1</sup>; 334<sup>m</sup>. כי easily fell out after בי.

45. M ביום אירי. This is too strong; it was not a יום איר. Read ביום אמצע.

49. Read ויגמלני (G).—52. M ולא רשעתי מאלדי, should mean, 'I have not been wicked in my God's judgment' (see Job iv. 17). But

however rendered, it is against parallelism. Read certainly עֲזָבָתִי (cp. xvii 5).

54. Read, with 2 S., לֹא אֲסוּר מִמֶּנָּה (cp. note above). מִנִּי after אֲסוּר (so M) is superfluous; see Josh. xi. 15. Klo.'s doubtfully suggested (cp. Job xxxviii. 10) is improbable.

60. M גָּבַר; 2 S. גִּבּוֹר. Omit as a dittographed גָּבַר. See next note. Luc. in 2 S. implies no גָּבַר (μετὰ ἀθώου). So Klo.

61. M תִּתְגַּבֵּר; 2 S. תִּתְגַּבֵּר. Read תִּתְגַּבֵּר (Klo.). There is a trace of this reading in M's גָּבַר (גִּבּוֹר) in l. 60. Thus the antitheses become complete.

62. M עֵקֶשׁ, not a suitable || to גִּבּוֹר. Read either עֵשֶׂק or (better) עֵתֶק; cp. on lxiii. 8.—M תִּתְפַּל, most unsuitable. 2 S., תִּתְפַּל. Read תִּתְפַּל (Job x. 16).

64. M עֵינַי רְמוּת (a reminiscence of cxxxi. 1). Better, as 2 S., וְעֵינַי עַל-רְמוֹת, where, however, עַל כּ should be כָּל (Klo.) Correct accordingly.

65. Omit תֹּאדָר ('lightest,' cp. Isa. xxvii. 11, Mal. i. 10). תֹּ arose from dittography; אִיר from אֹרִי, a gloss on נִרִי (Klo.). Read כִּי-אֲתָהּ יְהוָה נִרִי; l. 66 begins with אֱלֹהֵי.

67. M נִדּוּד. Luc. in 2 S. πεφραγμένους = נִדָּר. So Lag., Klo., Bā., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Kau. But the corruption lies deeper. נִדּוּד comes from גִּלְעָד (cp. the allusion in lx. 9), and גִּלְעָד (as occasionally elsewhere) comes from גִּלְגַּל, or rather יִרְחֵמָאֵל. See ll. 97 f. That אֶרֶץ should be אֶרֶץ is generally admitted.

68. M אֶדְלֶג-שׁוּר. So 2 S. But שׁוּר 'wall' only occurs again in Gen. xlix. 22, and דִּלֵּג should be followed by עַל. Read אֶחָלֶק נֶשׁוּר (cp. allusion in lx. 8).

69. Read probably דְּרָכָיו [פְּעֻלוֹ וַיִּשְׂרִים כָּל-] (Bi.). The stanza requires an insertion; the sense too is improved. Cp. Dt. xxxii. 6, which Sievers has overlooked.

72. Read לְכָל-חֹסִים (metre). Cp. Ley, *Leitfaden*, 43.

76. There is deep-seated but not incurable corruption. The תִּמִּים of M and G cannot be right. 'Soundness' can no doubt be predicated of individuals (Prov. i. 12; cp. Job xxi. 23), but not of a 'way' or 'career.' Du.'s rendering 'wohlbehalten' shows how unsuitable the epithet is here. No slight correction will avail. Parallelism suggests וַיִּחַנֵּר מִתְּנִי נִבּוּרָה. נִבּוּרָה in ר is attested by 2 S. (וִיתֵר, which is too summarily dismissed by the critics), נ by Ps. (וִיתֵנּוּ); ח and ת are often confounded. נִ in מִתְּנִי was mistaken (as often) for מ. נִ in נִבּוּרָה became כ; ב became ד.

78. M במותי, where י is dittographic. Read בָּמוֹת (G in Ps. and 2 S., also in Hab. iii. 19). So Gr., Klo., Kau. Dt. xxxiii. 29 is not parallel.

80. M ונחתה, fem. sing. before the verb in plur. (Kön., *Synt.*, § 348 o), or a survival of a 3rd plur. perf. in â (Peters, in Kön., § 348 r). 2 Sam. has ונחת. The word is *said* to mean, ' (so that . . .) presses down ' ; but it *ought* to mean, ' and (the bow) is broken. ' The proper word would be וְהוֹדְרִיכָה. T gives, ' makes my arms as strong as a bow of bronze ' ; similarly Klo., וְנִתְּן. This, however, is not natural. ונחתה represents לוֹ and לוֹ dropped out, נ and ר, ע and ח, were confounded ; ה became ל.

82.\* M וימינך תסעדני, which can barely be reckoned as a trimeter. In 2 S., M has only וַיַּעֲנֶתְךָ תְּרַבְּנִי. M, in Ps., gives after the above וַיַּעֲנֶתְךָ תֵּרַחֲבִי, which must be miswritten for וַיַּעֲנֶתְךָ תֵּרַחֲבִי (ע is due to Ol.) ; the עֲנָה of Yahwè ('A E' *παύσης σου* ; so J) is hardly a possible expression ; indeed, G Θ in Ps. give ἡ παύεῖα σου (so S), and G in 2 S., but unnaturally. תֵּרַח has arisen out of the next word תֵּרַחֲבִי. Read ' וימינך תסעדני '.

84. M קַרְסְלִי need not be questioned, though an Aramaism (see T, Ps. l. 11), and though G here has τὰ ἄλγῃ μου (עֲקֵבַי). [In 2 S. G. gives τὰ σκέλη μου, but one of Luc.'s two renderings is ἐν ταῖς i.e. במסלתתי.] קַרְסְלִי also in x. 6b and xxx. 8 (corr. texts).

91. M עָרַף. Read טָרַף (cxxiv. 6). The phrase נָתַן עָרַף means ' to flee. ' In Ex. xxiii. 27 the same correction is required.

92. M וכשנאי אצמיתם, but neither sense nor metre is satisfied. Read ומש' מצאה ימיני יתם (cp. xxi. 9). יתם is a perfectly regular corruption of ימיני.

93. For יִשְׁעֵי 2 S. has יִשְׁעֵי (so Ol.).—94. עַל 2 S., correctly אֶל.

95. For רוּחַ Lag., Bā. (and now Du.) read רָחַב, correctly. But כַּעֲפֹר־אֶרֶץ is superfluous. 2 S. simply אֶרֶץ.

96. For אֲדִיקֶם, 17 MSS. Kenn. and 7 de R. have אֲדִיקֶם, supported by G S T in Ps. 2 S has אֲדִיקֶם אֲרִקֶם, two rival readings side by side. Ew., Ol., Gr., Bā., Gr. prefer אֲדִיקֶם ; We. and Du. waver between this reading and אֲרִקֶם. Hi., Del., Klo., however, follow Ps. (M). It seems to me that the reading which has most claims is אֲרִקֶם, because from this we can account for the rise of the other readings. But it is surely not less unsuitable than they are. We must, therefore, look behind it for the true reading, which, in my opinion, certainly is See the striking parallel, 1 K. xiv. 21.

97. M מִרְיָי עָם (2 S. עָמִי). A reference to civil wars is altogether unsuitable. Some definite historical allusion is to be expected. Read מִעַם עֲרָבִים; cp. xliii. 1, &c.

98. M in both texts makes this v. 49 c; thus one stanza is too short, another too long. So Du.; Bi. transfers v. 49 b.—M חָמָס; 2 S. חֲמָסִים. Read כּוֹשֵׁם (L. 6). Cp. the frequent corruption of כ' into שכם.

101 f. 2 S. gives the right order of the lines (Bi., Klo., Du.).—M בְּנֵי נֶכֶר. Read בְּנֵי נֶכֶל, and restore historical colouring (lxxxiii. 8).—M לִי יִכְחָשׁוּ; 2 S. יִתְכַחֲשׁוּ (Cp. Dt. xxxiii. 29, Nif.). Most since Ges. have ascribed to כחש in this passage, in lxvi. 3, lxxxi. 16, and in Dt. l.c. the sense of feigned submissiveness (*BDB* gives no alternative). But, as a meritorious but forgotten scholar (J. Rogers, *Psalms*, 1834, ii. 176) well remarks, 'Ges. adduces no evidence to prove this, nor is the supposition borne out by the context in any of the passages.' On the other hand, Rogers does not justify the sense 'to submit.' Doubtless we should everywhere correct either into שָׁחָה (Hithp.) or better into שָׁחַר. Read here יִשְׁחָרְוּ לִי (cp. Job viii. 5).—M's text of v. 45 a curiously disguises the Ishmaelites (for another disguise see title). Read יִשְׁמַעְיֵאלִים לִי יֵאֱזִינוּ. Cp. הָאֲזִין in Neh. ix. 30.

103. M G בְּנִינֶכֶר. Clearly an error, caused by L. 101. Read לְבָנָה (cp. Isa. lx. 6). ל dropped out, owing to the preceding לִי; י also dropped out (illegible?). We certainly need a reference to the tribute of the foreign vassals.

104. M וַיִּחְרְגוּ; 2 S., וַיִּחְגְּרוּ (so Klo.). Neither חָרַג 'to tremble' (Aram.), nor חָגַר 'to gird on,' or 'to bind,' or 'to limp' (another Aram. sense, adopted by G in Ps.—ἐχλάσαν) gives a satisfactory meaning. Luc. in 2 S., ἐλευσθήσαν, perhaps = וַיִּפְרְקוּ (חָרַר 'to liberate,' Aram., is hardly the root, as Nestle, *ZATW*, '96, 324, supposes). The right word must surely be וַיִּקְרְבוּ.—M מִמִּסְגְּרוֹתֵיהֶם; in 2 S., suff. מֵם. An unsuitable reading suggested by וַיִּחְרְגוּ? Luc. in 2 S., ἐκ τῶν δεσμῶν αὐτῶν. Klo., מוֹסְרֵיהֶם. But the corruption lies deeper than Klo. supposes. Some form of tribute must be referred to. Read most probably בָּתָם, and on Mic. vii. 17 see *Crit. Bib.*

105 f. M חַי־יְיָהוָה (followed by וַיִּבְרָךְ and וַיִּרְוֶם). חַי and יְיָ seem to go together, and to imply a 'triumphant' declaration respecting Yahwè; וַיִּבְרָךְ too can, of course, be taken as declaratory. But this view does not suit the close of a psalm, and elsewhere חַי־יְיָהוָה means *ita Deus vivat*. There must be error in the text. Read probably מְהִלָּה the second י in M is dittographic.—For וַיִּרְוֶם read וִירָם (cp. Ol.).

108. M וַיִּדְבֵּר. G here ὑποτάξας; in 2 S. παιδεύων. There מתבר ('broke'), but in xlvii. 4 ילמל ('killed'). 2 S., מוריד, which Klo. and Briggs prefer. But this is surely one of those easy corrections to which the ancient editors were too prone. xlvii. 4, evidently a parallel passage, has ידבר [ו], which should mean 'drove together,' and is impossible. After repeated consideration, I must decline We.'s correction (here and in xlvii. 4) וַיִּרְבֵּד [ו], 'he stretched out as a pavement' (Mishn. רִבֵּד, Targ. רובדא) as too far-fetched an expression. Nor is Herz's וַיִּדְרֹךְ quite natural with תחת. I suspect that the right word is וַיִּדְכֵּא; cp. Lam. iii. 34. The corruption into וידבר first arose in xlvii. 4, owing to the retroactive influence of יבחר (note ב and ר) in v. 5. Then an editor adjusted xviii. 48 to xlvii. 4.

109. M מאיבי אף. אף springs from כף (cp. title), which fell out both in 2 S. and originally in Ps. In Ps., however, it was restored in the wrong place in the distorted form אף (Klo.).

110. M מוֹקְמִי; cp. 2 S. וּמִקְמִי (plainly an early conjectural correction). Read מִירְחֵמָל; ר became נ, ח became ק. תרומ' is not the natural verb. Read תִּשְׁמְרֵנִי; cp. xliii. 1.

111 f. Duhm prefers to relegate v. 50 to the margin as an interpolation, and to adopt v. 51 for the text. Certainly v. 51 is intended as a continuation of the description of Yahwè's mercies in vv. 47-49; עֲלִיכֹן connects better with v. 36 46. But the introduction of 'his king' and 'his anointed' should make us pause. There is no reference elsewhere in the psalm to the royal character of the speaker. And it is fitting that, as the psalm began with 'I will extol thee,' so it should close with 'I will give thanks to thee.' עֲלִיכֹן sums up the whole contents of the psalm.

### PSALM XIX.—I.

**TETRAMETERS.** Subject, the glory of God in the heavens, and especially in the sun. Unless the remainder of the poem, which presumably related to the moon and the stars (cp. on l. 1), was omitted by the editor, on the ground that these luminaries were treated of in Ps. viii., we must suppose that the editor only had this fragment before him. Whether the poet had access to ancient hymns to Yahwè as maker of the sky, we cannot tell. The Aramaism חִוָּה, not to urge רָקִיעַ, confirms the natural view that this psalm of creation (see on l. 1) is post-exilic. Psalms xix.<sup>1</sup> and xix.<sup>2</sup> may quite possibly have been combined in the Greek period. See on Ps. i. (also composite, but of later date). On the composite psalm, cp. *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 55-70.

*Deposited. Marked: of 'Arab-ethan.*

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | The heavens tell out the glory of God, | 2 |
|   | The sky reports the work of his hands. |   |
|   | Day pours out tidings unto day,        | 3 |
|   | And night shows knowledge unto night.  |   |

Their sound travels into all the earth,	4 <i>b</i> , 5 <i>a</i>
Their words are heard at the end of the world ;	5 <i>a</i>
Surely thou hast stablished chambers,	4 <i>a</i> , 4 <i>b</i>
For the sun thou hast appointed his palace.	5 <i>b</i>
He is like a bridegroom issuing from his alcove,	6
10 And joys like a hero to run on his road :	
At one end of the heavens is his going forth,	7 <i>a</i>
To the other he pursues his circling course ;	.
? And there is nothing hidden from his heat ?	7 <i>b</i>

1. **Tell out.** So Wycliffe, finely. Probably the sun, moon, and stars are meant, or, more precisely, the spirits who were popularly believed to be the tenants of the heavenly bodies. As the stars sang for joy at creation (Job xxxviii. 7), so now they 'tell out' and 'report' God's first and greatest work (so Du.). אֵל, not יְהוָה, because the whole human race listens to this 'report' (דְּבִיר, as l. 6, xcvii. 6). רָקִיעַ. Nine times in Gen. i., four times in Ezek., once in Dan.; also in cl. 1. Not in Job, not even in xxxvii. 18. See Driver, *Journ. of Philology*, xi. 212, but cp. Cornill, *Eintl.*, 65.

3 f. 'A wonderful verse; of all those which glorify God in nature, one of the most beautiful' (Du.). There is an uninterrupted tradition of creation's wonders. The days and nights are represented as having had an independent, transcendental existence (cp. Job iii. 1-10). יְבִיעַ—conveys the notion of an inspired stream of words (cp. lxxviii. 2), unless the Hifil has lost its proper significance, so that the word means simply 'utter' (cp. Ges.-Bu.).

Aram., elsewhere only in Job (five times, incl. xiii. 17).

7 f. A distant echo of the old Babylonian sun-myth. The heavenly vault has two gates; from one the sun issues at dawn; by another he returns in the evening. The bolts of heaven are mentioned in the Creation story. This

also illustrates the phrase 'the gate of heaven' (Gen. xxviii. 17). On the chamber of the sun and the portals of the sky, see also Enoch xli. 5 and lxxii. See Karppe, *Journ. As.*, janv.-févr. '97, pp. 88 ff.; Pinches, in Hastings, *DB*, i. 193*b* (top).—הִכִּין, as in l. 1 of the fragment of 'Solomon's psalm' (*OP*, 212). הִכֵּל, a good exchange for אֹהֶל! Clément Marot, the Huguenot translator, felt this. He paraphrases, Dieu en eux ha posé  
Palais bien composé  
Au Soleil clair et munde.

9. **Like a bridegroom.** A primitive solar myth (cp. 'Sun,' *Enc. Bib.*) has died down into a metaphor. Cp. Rig Veda, ix. 86, 32 (of the setting sun), 'The husband of the wives approaches the end' (Max Muller). A bridegroom is also the symbol of youthful vigour; cp. *Pirke Aboth*, v. 21, 'He who is eighteen years old is (ripe) for the *huppah*.'—*From his alcove*. See Joel ii. 16. The *huppah* was a part of the nuptial chamber curtained off for the bride, and probably a survival of the wife's separate tent (Gen. xxiv. 67).

10. מֶלֶךְ—'lord,' 'mighty one,' is a frequent epithet of Šamaš, the Babylonian sun-god (Muss-Arnolt, *Ass. Dict.*, 19). The sun's swiftness reminds us of the picture of a warrior in xviii. 34, and of the 'horses of the sun,' 2 K. xxiii. 11 (but see 'Nathan-melech,' *Enc. Bib.*). Cp. also Sirach xliii. 5*b* in G, 'and by his word he (the sun) runs (his) course.'

*Critical Notes.* 5 f. Our first step must be to combine material from *v.* 5*a* and *v.* 4*b*, viz., בלי נשמע קולם and בכל-הארץ קנם. The latter reading is correct so far as קולם is concerned. קנם ('A, ὁ κανὼν αὐτῶν) is impossible. G (ὁ φθόγγος αὐτ.), Σ (ὁ ἦχος αὐτ.), and J (*sonus eorum*) may perhaps have read קולם, though elsewhere G renders קול by φωνή, and Bā. thinks that the translators understood קו like τύπος from τείνω. At any rate, קולם is right (note Pasek, which refers probably to קנם). [Budde (*Exp. T.*, Dec. 1900, pp. 140 ff.) renders M, 'over the whole earth reaches their measuring-line,' and sees in קו a poetical term for the arch of heaven, which 'is, as it were, the measuring-line, the measure of the whole earth.' Is this natural? and why the suffix -ם? Kraetzschmar (*Exp. T.*, Sept. 1901, pp. 567 f.) would therefore read קבם 'their arch (?)'. But יצא surely does not mean 'rises up.' Does not the parallelism decide the true reading?] בלי in *v.* 4*b* is a corruption of כל-הארץ. נשמע probably comes from נשמעני, which is wanted for *L.* 6, to complete sense and metre.

7 f. Here we must first combine material from *v.* 5*b* and 4*a*, viz. לשמש שם אהל בהם and אין אמר ואין דברים. Both represent editorial attempts to make sense of two corrupt readings of the same passage; observe the Pasek after שם in *v.* 5*b*. Naturally enough, some critics (*e.g.* Ol., Bi., Che.<sup>1</sup>, We., Du.) have rejected *v.* 4 as an extremely weak gloss. But here, as often elsewhere, this easy course is a mistake. בהם in *v.* 5*b*, as in lxxxix. 3*b*, represents הִכְנִיתָ = הִכְנִיתָ, and underlying *v.* 4*a* we detect חֲדָרִים חֲדָרִים. אף שם הכִּנִּיתָ חֲדָרִים and אין דברים and חֲדָרִים, אין and אף, are easily confounded. In אמר we notice that an imperfectly written ש has become an א, while ר and ך together have become ה; אין is an expansion of ין, influenced by the first אין.—For שם אהל read שִׁמַּת

י; see crit. n. on xv. 1, and note the parallelism between חֲדָרִים and

י. Herz refers to an ancient opinion in IE that אהל is a derivative of אהל (הלל) 'to shine,' and conjectures that ש in שם is dittographed, and that we should read מאהל; cp. the incorrect form יאהל, Job xxv. 5. Gr. is content with בים for בהם, while Ol., Bi., Che.<sup>1</sup>, We., Du.(?) assume a lacuna between מליהם and לשמש.

12. Read perhaps עֲדֵקְצָתוֹ (על for עֲד, as xlvi. 11).

13. This line in M is prosaic and deficient by one beat.

## PSALM XIX.—2.

PENTAMETERS. Far inferior to xix.<sup>1</sup>, but valuable as a record of the love which the expanded law-book had already attracted among pious Jews, who transferred to it a part of the child-like love and fear which they felt for the Father of Israel, recognizing that their whole moral and spiritual life had been



placed by it upon a new basis. Cp. Ps. i., cxix., cxlvi. 19 f., Dt. iv. 8. Truly, 'the word was very nigh' to the writer, '(it was) in his mouth and in his heart, that he might practise it' (Dt. xxx. 14). Vainly does Sellin (*De Origine Carminum*, 92) attempt to date the psalm in the time of Josiah. Dt. iv. 8 (cp. Ps. xix. 106) is no part of Josiah's law-book, and the tremulous conscientiousness of ll. 9, 10 is specially characteristic of the next age after Ezra, when there was also a constant danger of the 'great transgression' (l. 12) of apostasy. Observe the point of contact between l. 5 and xii. 7; the promise is that of the Messianic deliverance (see e.g. Dt. xxxii. 36-43). The psalm is liturgical. See on ll. 9, 13, and cp. Coblenz, 104 ff. Ll. 15 f. being of the same metre as the rest of the poem, I see no occasion to view it as a later addition (Buddle, *77Z*, 1896, col. 561 f.; Grimm, *Liturg. Aph.*, 10 f.).

- 1 Perfect is Yahwè's law, | refreshing the soul, 8  
 Sure is Yahwè's declaration, | making wise the simple ;  
 Right are Yahwè's behests, | rejoicing the heart, 9  
 Spotless is Yahwè's commandment, | enlightening the eyes ;  
 Pure is Yahwè's promise, | enduring for ever, 10  
 True are Yahwè's ordinances, | right altogether,  
 [The statutes of] Yahwè are more precious | than gold,  
 than fine gold, 11  
 His words are sweeter than honey, | than droppings of the  
 comb.  
 By thee too is thy servant cautioned ; | observing them  
 brings a great reward. 11  
 10 Who can discern failings ? | from unnoticed +failings+ acquit  
 thou me. 13  
 Protect thy servant also from the insolent, | let them not  
 rule over me ; 14  
 Then shall I be blameless and guiltless | of the great trans-  
 gression.  
 Let the words of my mouth and the musing of my  
 heart | appear acceptable 15  
 Before thee continually, O Yahwè, | my Rock and my  
 Redeemer !

1. **Refreshing the soul.** See on xxxiii. 3.—5. *Pure*, i.e. free from error, true (see l. 6). Cp. xii. 7.

6. **Right altogether.** Cp. Dt. iv. 8, Ps. cxix. 7, 62, &c.—7 f. *More precious . . . sweeter.* Cp. cxix. 72, 127, 103. The same figures for the preciousness and sweetness of wisdom, Prov. ii. 4, iii. 14 f., viii. 10 f., 19, xvi.

16, 24, xxii. 1, xxiv. 13; Job xxxviii. 15 ff. In fact, wisdom and the law became synonymous; cp. Eccles. xxiv. 23.

9, 11. **Thy servant**, i.e. Israel, or rather the true Israel—the company of the suffering and faithful righteous; cp. xxvii. 9, xxxi. 17, lxix. 18, lxxxvi. 2, 16, lxxxix. 40, cxvi. 16, cxix. 125,

cxliii. 2, 12 (cp. on Isa. xlii. 1), but not cxxxvi. 22, where 'Israel his servant' refers to the Israel of the distant past. This view of 'thy servant' is confirmed by *l.* 14b, 'my Rock and my Redeemer.' נִזְוֶר, 'cautioned,' 'diverted from a dangerous path' (Bevan, *Daniel*, 202; Schulthers, *Homonyme Wurzeln*, 22).

#### 10. Fallings, שְׁגִיאוֹת (ᾠπ.

λεγ.), i.e. errors due to ignorance or inadvertence (Lev. iv., v., xxii., Num. xv. 22-26); cp. 'Sins of Ignorance,' *Enc. Bib.—Unnoticed*. Cp. Lev. v. 3,

etc., i.e. remit to me the punishment.

#### 11. From the insolent, מְזִידִים.

Kön. (*Synt.* p. 147), 'from arrogant

thoughts and endeavours.' But this does not suit 'rule over me.' The meaning is that under a foreign yoke Israelites are in constant danger of breaking the law, and even of apostatizing (cp. ἡ ἀποστασία, 1 Macc. ii. 15). 'Backsliding' brought ancient Israel to ruin; the great object of Ezra was to prevent a recurrence of the old evils and the old punishment. The 'insolent' are the oppressors of the pious, whether of non-Jewish or Jewish race; cp. cxix. 21, 51, 69, 78, Mal. iii. 15. חֲשֵׁךְ כֶּן, 'protect from,' as lxxviii. 50.

16a. Prayer, a spiritual sacrifice; cp. cxli. 2.—*Rock . . . Redeemer*. Titles of Yahwè in relation to Israel (cp. introd.).

*Critical Notes.* 5. מִירֵאת; note Paseḵ after י'. A fresh term for Law is required. Read certainly אִמְרַת (xii. 7, xviii. 31, Prov. xxx. 5). So Gr., and, since this was written, D. H. Müller and Kautzsch.

7 f. Read, with D. II. Müller (*Strophenbau u. Responsion*, 60),

יְהוָה נִחְמָדִים

M's הַנִּחְמָדִים is not clear, and we expect such a common title as חֲקִים not to be omitted. Metre too gains by Müller's excellent restoration.

11 f. G reads מְזִידִים. Paseḵ indicates uncertainty.—Read אִתֶּם (Ol., &c.).

14. Insert תְּמִיד, Ley (G διαπαντός, as xvi. 8, &c.). Note Paseḵ in v. 15a.

## PSALMS XX. AND XXI.

**TRIMETERS.** Psalms xx. and xxi. are among the most enigmatical in the collection. Can the reference to 'the king' be correct. Let us first of all assume the traditional view, and consider how best to explain these psalms. I. Who can the king be? Theodore of Mopsuestia long ago thought of Hezekiah (Bä., *ZATW*, 1885, p. 93); among the moderns Hitzig takes this view. Josiah has also been suggested for Ps. xx. (Renan; Che.; see *OP*, 199, 208). Kautzsch even goes so far as to say (*Abriß*, 207; *O. T. Lit.*, 143) that Pss. xx., xxi., xlv. can only be understood as pre-exilic songs; this, however, is too hasty a conclusion. For if on other grounds the psalms must be post-exilic, we may be sure that it is only our own narrow vision which prevents us from seeing how to understand aright the references to a king. Now it is certain (a) that there is nothing in the linguistic forms, or the choice of phrases, or the religious ideas to distinguish these psalms from the other psalms in the first 'David'-collection. (b) And that very

bitterness in the tone of xxi. ll. 17-22, which may seem to suggest an early period of development, is really a subsidiary evidence of a late date. For whenever the sufferings of the Jews were specially intense, they broke into expressions akin to those in Ps. xxi.; spiritual development could not but be checked so long as the hostility of the nations imperilled Israel's very existence (*OP*, 295). (c) The oracular or prophetic tone of parts of these twin-psalms may also appear to favour an early date. These parts are no doubt somewhat akin to the promises of Nathan in 2 S. vii., which are commonly held to be pre-exilic. But those promises were a favourite theme of post-exilic poets (cp. Ps. lxxxix.), and such poets, inasmuch as they carried on the work of the older writers, and were conscious of speaking in the name of a divinely inspired people, were wont to claim prophetic inspiration; the Psalter is full of evidences of this. See especially Pss. lx., cx. (d) The transition from 'we' to 'I' in xx. l. 13 (cp. lxxxv. 9), and the reference to Zion as the theocratic centre (cp. xiv. 7, lxviii. 36) are also indications of lateness. (e) Among the late phrases, notice רִיבֹנָה, xxi. 14;

cp. lvii. 6, 12, xlvii. 11. Cp. also xx. 8 with xxxiii. 17, cxlvii. 10; xxi. 5 with xlv. 3, lxi. 7.—II. Can we indicate any one part of the (O.T.) post-exilic period as more probably the date than another? (a) The bitterness of the tone in Ps. xxi. would be appropriate to the period of Antiochus Epiphanes. In xxi. 7f. there might be a glance at the victories of Judas over the Syrian cavalry at Emmaus and Beth-zur (*OP*, 199). This would imply that Simon the Maccabee was the 'king'<sup>1</sup> (see on v. 4 and on Ps. cx.). Smend (*Rel.-gesch.* 385) as well as the writer, formerly at least, have accepted a Maccabean date, and if a reference to contemporary history be indispensable, the date proposed in *OP*, 199, is the most probable one (cp. note on xxi. 1-12). But though Maccabean psalms in the first Psalter are not in the abstract impossible, there are the weightiest reasons for hesitating to accept them, except under stronger pressure. (b) Might the king be a high-priest? So Beer, *Gem. Ps.* p. lxiv. Certainly the post-exilic high-priest enjoyed not a little of the old regal prestige. If, among his other privileges, he could wear a golden כִּנֹּר, it was not much exaggeration to call

him 'king' (Philo does so), especially in the temple where it was traditional to sing psalms referring to the king. See *OP*, 200, 218f. (c) Might the king, at any rate in Ps. xxi., be the idealized people (Gray, *JQR*, July, 1895, p. 685)? This is only one step in advance of the theory (see on xxvii. 8) that the people of Israel is now and then called 'Yahwe's anointed.' But that theory is improbable. As long as an almost royal high-priest existed in actuality, and the ideal king almost existed in pious imagination as the leader and representative of the people, it is not likely the Jewish sentiment would have approved such a bold transference of the old individualistic title 'king' to the community. (d) Might Zerubbabel be meant? This is Beer's alternative view (cf. on lxi., lxxxix., cx., cxxxii.); Sellin (*Zerubbabel*, 189f.) also holds it.<sup>2</sup> It is a plausible theory (cp. *JRL*, 6, 8, 14-16). But Zerubbabel's aspirations (assuming some probable inferences from Haggai and Zechariah) can hardly have succeeded so far as to justify the composition of war-lyrics in his honour as Messianic king. (e) Might the king be the Messiah? This view attributes great imaginative licence to the psalmist, but the vivid realization of the Messianic hope may conceivably have led to such extravagances. Such imaginative licence certainly does appear to have been taken in the composition of Pss. xlv. and lxxii.; but these two psalms stand in a class by themselves, being both obviously addressed to a personage poetically modelled on the conventional Solomon. We should, however, find ourselves compelled with less justification to suppose a similar imaginative licence in the composition of Pss. xx., xxi. (cp. *JRL*, 104 ff.; *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 73-79), if no better solution presented itself.

It appears to the writer that such a solution is provided by a keen textual

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *Crit. Rev.*, Jan. 1893, pp. 25f.

<sup>2</sup> So too *Studien zur Entstehungsgesch. der jüd. Gemeinde*, ii. [1901], 189. In his earlier work, *De origine carminum* &c. [1892], pp. 44ff., Sellin insisted earnestly on the necessity of a pre-exilic date.

criticism. In Pss. lxi. and lxiii. it is even more necessary than here to question the correctness of the readings מֶלֶךְ, הַמֶּלֶךְ, and this fact justifies us in hoping for a corresponding solution of our present problem. On the analogy of similar combinations of transcriptional errors elsewhere we have to correct 'the king' into 'thy loyal one' (see crit. notes on xx. 7, xxi. 8). God's 'loyal one' (חֲסִיד, see on xvi. 10) is the pious community, whose salvation in time of trouble brings joy to each and all of its members (xx. 6a), and who can permissibly be described both as a person and as a collection of persons (xx. 10a and b; xx. 6, xxi. 2). The deliverance referred to is the Messianic.

*Deposited. Marked : of 'Arab-ethan.*

- 1 May Yahwè answer thee in the day of distress ; 2  
 May<sup>1</sup> Jacob's God set thee on high !  
 May he send thee help from the sanctuary, 3  
 And uphold thee +with aid+ from Zion !  
 May he remember all thine offerings, 4  
 And accept all thy requests !  
 May he grant thee thy heart's desire, 5  
 And accomplish all thy purpose !  
 We will shout for joy at the succour granted thee, 6  
 10 And exult because of the name of our God ;  
 For Yahwè has succoured his loyal one, 7  
 [And] answered him from his holy heaven.  
 Cusham and Jerahmeel are strong ; 8  
 For our part we gather strength through<sup>2</sup> our God.  
 As for them they bend forward and fall, 9  
 But we arise and stir up our courage.  
 O Yahwè ! give succour to thy people, 10  
 And answer us when we cry.

1-9. Pious wishes of Israelites gathered in the temple at the morning or evening sacrifice. At such a solemn time the individual Israelite realized that 'Israel' had a personal life greater than his own, and capable of being viewed as distinct from his own.

5 f. Prayer and offerings are naturally combined ; special prayer gave a special meaning to the sacrifice. Hence the prayer in cxli. 2.—*Requests* ; see on xxi. 3 b.

10. **The name of our God, i.e.** the presence of Yahwè amongst his people, specially in the temple. See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Name.'—11. *Has succoured, i.e.* on the occasion referred to in l. 9 ; **הוֹשִׁיעַ** is the future perfect. The psalm points forward to the culminating succour of the great judgment, when all Israel's foes, represented by the bitter N. Arabian oppressors, will be put down.—*His loyal one.* See on xvi. 10.

<sup>1</sup> The name of.

<sup>2</sup> The name of Yahwè.

13 f. See crit. note. The contrast between the natural strength of 'Cush-am and Jerahmeel,' and the supernatural strength (cp. xviii. 35) of pious Israel is well indicated by a variety in

the conjugation of the same verb.—15. The tense is the perfect of confidence. Hence in *l.* 17 'succour' is still prayed for. Cp. xxviii. 9.

*Critical Notes.* 2, 14. M, for uniformity (see *l.* 10) and for reverence, inserts **שֵׁם יְהוָה, שֵׁם**.

6. M gives this line in two forms, (1) **וְעוֹלָתְךָ יִדְשְׁנָה סֶלָה** [3 MSS. Kenn., 1 de R., S T, **עוֹלָתִיךָ**], and (2) **יְהוָה כָּל־מִשְׁאָלוֹתֶיךָ**. Evidently **יִדְשְׁנָה** (cp. Kön. ii. 510) is wrong; we have to read <sup>ִיִּשְׁן</sup> with Gr. (**ש** and **צ** confounded). **יִשְׁן** means 'to cleanse from ashes.' The psalmist certainly would not have risked misunderstanding, by using the word in the sense 'to reduce to ashes' (Ki.; cp. 1 K. xviii. 24, 36), or in the sense 'to account, or declare, fat' (Bä., Kau., Du., &c.), or in the Arabizing sense 'accipere munus altaris' (Kenn.). **יְמִלָּא** is merely a repetition from *v.* 4b; **סֶלָה** is a corrupt fragment of **מִשְׁאָלוֹתֶיךָ**; so too is **עוֹלָתֶיךָ**. See also on *ll.* 11 f.

10. M **גִּדְּגַל**. Ass. *diglu* must not be claimed on behalf of EV's rendering (also Ibn Ezra's), for *diglu* does not mean 'banner,' but 'object of gaze.' **גִּדְּגַל** as a Heb. root is incapable of critical proof (see *JQR*, xi. 232-236, and cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Ensign,' 'Tirzah.' Ol. (?), Bi., We., Du. read **גִּדְּגַל**, but **גִּדְּגַל בָּ** does not mean 'to magnify.' Street, **גִּדְּגַל**. But *μεγαλυνθησόμεθα* in G<sup>B</sup>, to which these scholars appeal, represents not **גִּדְּגַל**, but **גִּבְּבִיר** (cp. *v.* 8b in G<sup>B</sup>). B<sup>ab</sup> A<sup>A</sup> in *v.* 6 and A\* in *v.* 8 give *ἀγαλλιασόμεθα*, i.e. **גִּבְּבִיל**, which in *v.* 6 is certainly right (so Gr.).

11 f. Most probably **עֵתָה** and **יָדַעְתִּי** in M are both fragments of **עוֹלָתֶיךָ** (see on *l.* 6, end), and should therefore be omitted, while **מִשִּׁיחוֹ** comes from **חֲסִידוֹ**. Cp. on ii. 2, xxviii. 8, lxxxiv. 10, cv. 15), and on **מִשִּׁיחוֹ** in Isa. xlv. 1 see *Crit. Bib.*—Read **וַיַּעֲבֹדְהוּ** (1 absorbed in preceding suffix).

13. As to the construction of **יִשַׁע יְמִינוֹ בַּגְּבוּרוֹת** opinion is divided (cp. Bä. and Kau.). The phrase is metrically superfluous, but is too difficult to be a gloss. The following clause in M G is also difficult. The distinction between those who trust in chariots and those who trust in horses is artificial; besides the all-important verb 'trust' is omitted. We also have a right to expect some reference in Ps. xx., as well as in Ps. xxi., to the N. Arabian enemies. May not such a reference be latent in the traditional text? Nothing almost is commoner than editorial transformations of passages relative to the Jerahmeelites on the basis of an already corrupt text. May not this be one of the

transformed passages? Looking at *v.* 7*b* and *v.* 8*a* we notice that each contains one of the regular distortions of **יִרְחֵמָאֵל**, viz. **יָמִין** in *v.* 7*b* (cp. 1 S. ix. 1, &c.) and **אֱלֹהִים** in *v.* 8*a* (cp. 1 S. xvii. 2). I propose, therefore, as *l.* 13, **יִנְבְּרוּ כֹשֶׁם וִירְחֵמָאֵל**, supposing that *v.* 7*b* and *v.* 8 present two variant forms of the same line. I give the order of the words in accordance with *v.* 7*b*, so that **בִּרְכָּב בְּנִבְרוֹ** corresponds to **וְאֱלֹהִים** and **אֱלֹהִים** to **וְיָמִין** and **וְיָמִין** to **וְיָמִין**.

14. M **נִזְכָּר**. Read **נִנְבֵּר**; G<sup>B</sup> *μεγαλυντησόμεθα* (see on *l.* 10, and cp. xii. 5, G); so S and Street, Gr., Bā. **הַזְכִּיר**, 'to make solemn mention of' (Isa. xlviii. 1), will not suit *l.* 15.

16. M **וְנִתְעַדָּד** (cxlvi. 9, cxlvii. 6); G *ἀνωρθώθημεν*, J *erecti sumus*; scarcely defensible. Read **וְנִתְעוֹרֵר** (Gr., Herz).

17 f. M **הַמֶּלֶךְ**. Read **עֶמֶד** (xxi. 8). See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Psalms,' § 33, ii.—Read **וְעֶמֶד**, and attach **הַמֶּלֶךְ** (i.e. **עֶמֶד**) to *l.* 19 with G and most moderns.

*Deposited. Marked : of 'Arab-ethan.*

- |  |    |
|--|----|
|  | 1  |
| 1 O Yahwè ! for thy help thy people is glad,                           | 2  |
| Because of thy succour he greatly exults.                              |    |
| The desire of his heart thou hast given him,                           | 3  |
| The request of his lips thou hast not rejected.                        |    |
| For thou didst meet him with blessings of prosperity,                  | 4  |
| A crown of fine gold thou didst set on his head.                       |    |
| He asked of thee life,   | 5  |
| And thou gavest him endless days. <sup>1</sup>                         |    |
| Great through thy succour is his glory,                                | 6  |
| 10 With splendour and state dost thou endow him.                       |    |
| Yea, thou makest him thy fellow,                                       | 7  |
| Thou gladdenest him with joy in thy presence.                          |    |
| For thy people trusts in thee, O Yahwè !                               | 8  |
| Through thy loving-kindness, O Most High ! he will remain<br>unshaken. |    |
| Thy hand will reach all thine enemies,                                 | 9  |
| Thy right hand will lay hold on them that hate thee.                   |    |
| Thou wilt put an end to those of Rehoboth and of Ishmael,              | 10 |
| Thy presence, O Yahwè ! will annihilate them :                         |    |
| The Zarephathites thou wilt make to perish from the land,              | 11 |
| 20 And the Mişrites from the face of the ground.                       |    |

<sup>1</sup> For ever and ever.

For they have formed an evil aim against thee, 12  
 The Jerahmeelites have devised outrages.  
 For thou wilt put an end to Aram and Cusham, 13  
 Those of Rehoboth thou wilt rebuke to their face !

*Liturgical Appendix.*

Exalt thyself, O Yahwè ! in thy strength ; 14  
 We will sing and strike the lyre to thy might.

1-12. The people of Israel imagines itself in the coming ideal period when the 'desire of its heart' will be fully granted. Note allusions in *l.* 1, 3 to *xx. 3a, 7a*. What is it that pious Israel craves? It is to rejoice for ever in the consciousness of God's favour. For clearly *l.* 8 and 12 must be taken together. Cf. *xvi. 10 f.*, and note that *Ps. xvi.* is another utterance of the pious community. The phrase 'the request of his (my) lips' occurs again in *lxi. 6* (corr. text) with reference to the gift of eternal life for the people of Israel. Cf. also *xc. 15 f.*, where the gifts of glory, deliverance (succour), and length of days אָרְךָ יָמִים, as in *l. 8*, *i.e.* eternal life, are represented as granted in answer to prayer. The mention of a *crown of fine gold* (*l. 6*) is remarkable. If an individual were referred to, we might see in it a reference to the recognition of Simon the Maccabee as high priest and prince, and suppose the 'crown' to be the 'sacred crown' (כִּטּוֹן) of pure gold on the high-priestly tiara (*Ex. xxix. 6, xxxix. 30*; cf. *Ecclus. xlv. 12*). But a Maccabæan reference has been considered and rejected above. The crown intended can only be metaphorical. Man, simply as ruler of creation, is 'crowned with glory and state' (*viii. 6 f.*); and Israel is, ideally, 'a royal dynasty of priests' (*Ex. xix. 6*), and is destined to become the 'head of the nations' (*Ps. xviii. 44*).

8. **For ever and ever, עוֹלָם וָעֶד.** If an individual (whether Simon or the Messiah) were referred to, this would mean that the prince who is eulogized would live on in his successors.

It appears, however, to be Israel's eternity which is spoken of (see above).

10 ff. הוֹד וְהוֹדָר; cf. *viii. 2, 6*;  
*civ. 1.*—תְּשׁוּהָ עִלּוֹ; cf. *lxxxix. 20*.  
 —*Makest him thy fellow* (see crit. n). No 'evil man' or 'deviser of ruin' can have fellowship with Yahwè (*v. 5, xciv. 20*), but Israel, God's son and servant, is a member of the divine household. Contrast *Hos. iv. 17* (Ephraim, a 'fellow of idol-gods').—*Joy in thy presence.* Cf. *xi. 7, xvi. 11, cxi. 14.*—בֵּל יְמוֹט. So *xvi. 8* (Israel).

15-26. If we adhere to *M*, we may well be uncertain whether this part is addressed to Yahwè or to the king. Hupfeld decides for Yahwè, but almost all others (*Ol., Del., Now., Bâ., We., Du.*) are on the opposite side. It would be strange, however, that the psalmist should turn round in this fashion (hence Halévy would incorporate *vv. 9-14* in *Ps. xx.*); strange too that the vengeance of the king should (in the traditional text) be described in such glaring terms, and without any reference to the all-powerful aid of Yahwè. The text, moreover, is full of improbabilities, and the corrections favour an address to Yahwè. It is the great judgment which is referred to, when the enemies of Israel, represented by the *N. Arabians*, will be destroyed. Though this act of justice or of vengeance can be ascribed to Israel (*cp. Pss. ii., xviii.*), yet it is only through Yahwè that Israel will triumph, and sometimes Yahwè himself is described as the warrior who puts down the foes (see *Ps. cx.; Isa. lxiii. 1-6*).

*Critical Notes.* 1 *M* בעוֹד. Rather בְּעוֹרֵךְ (Nöldeke); cf. *xx. 3.*—*M's מלך* springs from עָפַךְ. *Cp. on l. 13.*

2. Omit **מה** (not in Vss.). The scribe began to write **מאר**; his successor, in error, wrote **מה**.

4. **מֵאַרְשֵׁת**; may we compare Ass. *eristu* (Del., *Prol.* 54 f. and *Ass. HWB.*)? Surely the style of the psalm is too plain to admit of such a far-fetched word. Read **מִשְׁאַלֶּת** (Gr.), or less probably **שְׁאַלֶּת** (cvi. 15). See xx. 6, xxxvii. 4, lxi. 6 (corr. text).

8. Metre suggests that **עולם ועד** is an interpolated gloss on **ימים**.

11. **מִבְּרָכוֹת**, (rich in) blessings? or, (the centre of) formulæ of blessing (cf. Zech. viii. 13)? But this does not yield a proper parallel to **חֲבִירָה** (see note above).

13. **הַמִּלֶּךָ**. Read **עֲמֹד** (see on xx. 10).—**יְהוָה**—an editorial correction. Read **בָּה**.—**מִבְּחֶסֶד**. Read **בְּחֶסֶדְךָ**.

16. **תִּמְצָא**, an unpleasing repetition. Read **תִּתְמַךְ**. Duhm **תְּבוֹא** (with accus.?).

17–24. M's text (opening of *v.* 10) expresses the anticipation that (as most understand) the king will make Israel's enemies like a fiery furnace (**כְּתִנּוֹר אֵשׁ**, preceded by *Pasek*), *i.e.* will destroy them so that they appear like a fiery furnace. Surely vindictiveness could have found a less artificial expression. The remainder of *v.* 10 supplies us with too much material for a single trimeter. Presumably the whole of *v.* 8 is corrupt. Is it likely that **פָּנִיךָ** was said of the king? And is not **וְתֹאכְלֵם אֵשׁ** a very lame conclusion to a verse or stanza? *V.* 11 is better, but can **פָּרִי** be used as a synonym for **זֶרַע**? Lam. ii. 20 is hardly quite parallel. *V.* 12 as Hebrew is just good enough to have escaped severe criticism, but the controversy over **נָטַר** (cp. Bāthg. and Wildeboer *ZATW*, xvii. 179) suggests that all cannot be right; critics also appear to have taken **בְּל יִכְבְּלוּ** too easily. In *v.* 13, however, the text is altogether impossible, **תְּשִׁיטְמוּ שָׁכֶם** is literally 'thou wilt make them [to be] back,' though König vainly tries to make out **שָׁכֶם** to be the accusative of relation, and for **תֵּשׁ** compares passages in which the object of **עָשָׂה** is to be supplied from the context. Most critics compare xviii. 41, and obtain the general sense, 'thou wilt put them to flight'; xviii. 41, however, is certainly corrupt. Apart from the context T's rendering might be plausible, 'thou wilt make them (*viz.* thy people) as one shoulder' (cp. Zeph. iii. 9). M's **בְּמִיתָרֶיךָ** is equally improbable. AV, to make sense, inserts 'thine arrows.' It would be simpler to substitute **בְּמִיתָרֶיךָ** for **בְּמִיתָרֶיךָ**. But we have no right to do this. And even were it otherwise, how improbable that the fitting of the arrows on the strings should come after the putting of the enemies to flight! **תִּכְוֶנוּ עַל-פְּנֵיהֶם** is also a strange expression. Returning to the passage after a wider experience of parallel



corruptions had supplied a key to a very large number of passages, the writer would emend thus,—

10 תִּשְׁבִּית רְחוֹבוֹת וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֵלָיו 17  
פָּנֶיךָ יְהוָה יְבַלְעֵם  
11 צִרְפָּתִים מֵאֶרֶץ תֹּאבָד  
20 וּמִצָּרִים מִפְּנֵי אֲדָמָה  
12 כִּי־נָתַנִּי עַל־יָד רָעָה  
חֲשָׁבוּ מִזֶּמֶר יִרְחֲמֵאֵלִים  
14 כִּי־תִשְׁבִּית אֶרֶם וְכָשֶׁם  
רְחוֹבוֹתֵי תוֹכִיחַ עַל־פְּנֵיהֶם

For פָּנֶיךָ in l. 18 cp. Lam. iv. 16, and note that בָּאֶפֶס in v. 10 is an interpolation.

### PSALM XXII.—I.

**T**RIMETERS. A prayer 'out of the depths.' No individual can be the speaker. Is there any one so prosaic as to maintain that either David, or Jeremiah, or Ezra could have used these words? Nor can the depressed Jewish people be the speaker; stanzas 3 and 4 show that an Israel within the larger Israel here pours out its griefs and woes. These woes it shares with all who have not practically rejected the Jewish law, and found means to conciliate those whom true Israelites ought, so far as possible, to shun, but a spiritual sorrow is theirs, which the mass of imperfect though not faithless Israelites cannot fully realize. They are constant in prayer, but how useless it seems! Unbelievers jeer at their folly; can such a 'worm' as Israel (v. 7) be said to have a God? Faithless Israelites, who know the phrases in which at this period faith delights, apply them sarcastically (v. 9). By word and deed they do their best to kill the faithful community. They are not indeed clothed with regal authority; they can but commit so many outrages and speak such bitter words (some of which may for a moment seem to Israel to be true) that Israel feels—though God all the while knows that it is not so—at the point of death. Note the parallels in Isa. xli. 14 ('worm,' 'redeemer'), xlix. 7 and liii. 3 ('despised of men'); xlix. 8 ('from the womb'); xlix. 14 ('Yahwè has forsaken me'), and in Job xix. 13 ff., xxx. 9 ff.

If we hold that Isa. xl.-lv. did not reach its present form till after the time of Ezra, it will be impossible to make Ps. xxii.<sup>1</sup> earlier than the very close of the Persian period, and a later date is not excluded, considering the influence of Job. Cp. *OP*, 230 ff.; Smend, 76 ff.; Coblenz, 136 ff. The view of Duhm and Winckler that the poet is himself the subject of the psalm, and that he wrote it while languishing in a Babylonian or a Jewish dungeon<sup>1</sup> is opposed to a sound textual criticism and exegesis. The poem represents a company or community. It is 'a complaint of highly-strung sensitive natures, brought up on the doctrine of earthly retribution, and surprised that they meet with the contempt and ignominy which are only worthy of malefactors. And the grandeur of the psalm consists in this—that in spite of the terrible strain put upon their faith, this divinely given quality does not fail them. Though God seems to have forsaken them, He is still their God.'<sup>2</sup> Happily there is but one voice among critics as to the spiritual beauty of the poem.

Cp. Winckler, *AOF*(2) i. 177 ff.; J. Döllner, 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Ps. xxii. (xxi.)', *Theol. Quartalschrift*, xxii. (1900), 174 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Duhm makes him a victim of the party-fights of the later Asmonæan kings, Winckler no less a person than king Manasseh.

<sup>2</sup> *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 93 f.

*Deposited. Of Ethan the Zarhite. Marked : Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

- 1 O my God ! to me give ear ; 2  
 Why hast thou forsaken my soul ?  
 [Why] keepest thou so far off, not to hear  
 The words of my cry, O my God ?  
 I call by day, but thou answerest not ; 3  
 By night, but thou interposest not for me ;  
 Yet Thou art Jacob's Holy One, 4  
 The God who is Israel's confidence.  
 In thee our fathers trusted, 5  
 10 They trusted, and thou didst deliver them ;  
 To thee they cried, and they found escape, 6  
 In thee they trusted, and they were not shamed.  
 But I am a worm and no human creature, 7  
 Insulted by mankind, and by all people despised.  
 All that behold me jeer at me, 8  
 They open their lips wide, and wag their heads +with a  
 scoff,+ —  
 ' Let God redeem him, let Him deliver him ! 6  
 Let him rescue him, seeing He delights in him ' !  
 Yea, Thou wast my refuge when I was born, 10  
 20 My confidence when I was on my mother's breasts.  
 On Thee have I found support from my birth, 11  
 Thou hast been my God from my mother's womb ;  
 Remain not afar, [O Yahwè], 12  
 Trouble is near, there is no helper.  
 Strong wild oxen surround me, 13  
 With pointed horns they mangle me ;  
 Fierce lions that raven and roar 14  
 Stretch open their jaws towards me.  
 [Within] I am poured out like water, 15  
 30 And all my bones are out of joint ;  
 My heart has become like wax,  
 It has melted away within me.  
 [My palate] is dried up like grass, 16  
 My teeth stick together in my jaws ;  
 With my crying my throat is parched, 17c  
 And upon mine eyelids is the gloom +of Deathland+ . 16c

Strong lions surround me,	17a
A troop of wild oxen encircles me ;	17b
My body is wasted by reason of my pains,	18
40 +But+ they give a kick to my wounds.	
The traitors walk to and fro,	19
And jeer at the anguish of my soul.	
But Thou art Yahwè, keep not afar off ;	20
Thou art my God, hasten to help me.	
Snatch my soul from the young lion,	• 21
My life from the paw of the greedy lion ;	
Deliver me from the mouth of the fierce lion,	22
Withdraw me from the horns of the wild oxen.	

2. For God to 'forsake' the soul means death (xvi. 10). And how can Yahwè forsake the soul of his loyal one (xvi. 10, xxxvii. 28, xciv. 14)? The loyalty of man presupposes that of God. But Zion herself complains, 'Yahwè has forsaken me' (Isa. xlix. 14).—4. Duhm, who retains דברי שאנתי (lit. 'the words of my roaring'), takes דבר in the sense of 'matter.' The sense is possible enough in *prose* style, but improbable in poetry. Duhm compares 1 S. x. 2, 1's. lxxv. 4; but the latter passage is corrupt.

6 ff. **Thou interposest not**; lit. 'thou liftest thyself not up,' i.e. 'arise not from thine inaction to assert thy sovereignty.'—*Jacob's Holy One*. So Isa. xxix. 23, where, as here, 'Jacob' and 'Israel' are parallel.—*Israel's confidence*. This strikes the key-note of the beautiful stanza which follows (see crit. n.). Those who adopt M's text suppose that the psalmist gives a new turn to the old phrase 'enthroned upon the cherubim' (lxxx. 2, xcix. 1) by substituting 'the praise-songs of Israel' for 'the cherubim.' The true 'chariots of deliverance' (Hab. iii. 8) are, not the mythic cherubim, but the prayers and praises of God's people (cf. viii. 3 in M's text). This view I have elsewhere supported (Ps.<sup>(1)</sup>; OP, 327), but it is certainly over-subtle, and a freer attitude towards M's text enables me to abandon it.

9-12. The appeal to Israel's past history. Cf. lxxvii. 5-8. *Our fathers*;

so xlv. 2, lxxviii. 3. Clearly Israel is the speaker (Lag., *Orientalia*, ii. 63), or rather the Israel within Israel.

13-16. **A worm &c.** Israel speaks, not some self-pitying individual. Cf. Isa. xli. 14. In the light of these two passages it should be clear that Isa. liii. 14, liii. 2 do not refer to an individual.—*Despised*. Cf. Isa. xlix. 7, liii. 3.—*Jeer at me*, &c. Cf. xxxi. 12 ff., xxxviii. 12, xli. 6 ff., lxix. 8 ff., lxxviii. 9, 19, Lam. ii. 15 f., iii. 46, and especially Job xxx.

17-20. **Let God redeem him, &c.** A reference to a favourite title of Yahwè in the Prophecy of Restoration (see Isa. xli. 14, xlix. 26, and often). Cp. xix. 15. The correction of the text adopted removes a great linguistic stumbling-block (see crit. n.).—*From my birth*. Lit., 'from the womb,' מרחם. Cf. lxxi. 6, Isa. xlviii. 8.—*On thee*, &c. Again compare lxxi. 6.

25. From this point onwards the greatest misunderstanding has been caused by corruptions of the text. Lagarde's ingenuity in explaining the choice of the several animals (*Orientalia*, ii. 63 f.; cf. OP, 232) is beyond question, but he presupposes the corrupt readings of M's text. Tobiah the Ammonite, Geshur the Arabian, Sanballat the Samaritan are not referred to under the respective symbols of bulls of Bashan, lions, and dogs, for the only animals which a strict criticism can recognize

appear to be 'wild oxen' (רָאִים) and 'lions' (לָבִיא, כְּפִיר, אַרְי). Both kinds of animals are symbols of the oppressors of the Jews. רָאִים naturally suggests יִרְחַמְאֵלִים, i.e. the 'wild oxen' are the Jerahmeelites. The 'lions' may conceivably include oppressors of native Jewish origin (cp. Zeph. iii. 3).—*With pointed horns.* On these dangerous horns (which were prized as trophies by the Assyrian hunter-kings), see on xcii. 11a. The passage seems to be imitated in xvii. 11, lxviii. 31 (corr. text).

29–36. Vital strength fails; dissolution seems at hand.—29. *I am poured out.* So, of the heart, Josh. vii. 5 (cp. l. 31;) of the soul, xxvii. 8 (corr. text), xlii. 5 (M).—33. Cp. lxix. 4, cii. 5.—34. A little different from Job xxix. 10.—35. Nothing is more difficult than to get a fit sense out of the received text. The text-critical problem seems now to have been solved. See crit. note.—36. Cf. Job xvi. 16.

38 ff. Some critics (Ewald, Winckl., Duhm) have supposed that the much-tried speaker is in prison or in the stocks, while a 'crew of evil-doers,'

also symbolically called 'dogs,' but really gaolers or rude warriors (Wi., Du.), gloat over his sufferings. This view however is based on textual error. Similarly the odd picture of the wounded man counting up his bones (or, his pains), while the 'dogs' enjoy the spectacle, vanishes into thin air like that other strange picture of the wild dogs mangling his hands and his feet. To some, the picture may seem strange, even as a more correct text presents it. But we must remember that the speaker is in reality a collection of persons. The wild oxen and the lions (i.e. the oppressors<sup>1</sup>) cannot all at once destroy Israel. The moral and physical sufferings of many Israelites may have wasted the national 'body,' but some life still remains. At present, all that the fierce beasts can do is to worry their victims, and to aggravate the pain of the wounds by 'kicking' them. *Give a kick*, cp. 'the paw of the greedy lion' (l. 46). Imitated in lxix. ll. 49 f. On lines 41, 42, which one would gladly have kept on account of the familiar application, see crit. note. Bāthgen's comment is, 'Israel resembles one slain on the battle-field, whose garments the soldiers divide among themselves by lot.' But is there anything in the context to favour this?

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. מֵאֵלֵי אֱלֹהִים. G ó θεός ó θεός μου πρόσχες μοι; Bb. הקשיבה לי. Read אֱלֹהֵי אֱלִי הקשיבה (cf. on xviii. 3 אֱלִי). The repetition of אֱלִי is not probable in a highly artistic poem (2 K. iv. 19 is therefore not parallel; in Jer. iv. 19 the first מַעִי is dittographic; see G). Soon after we have אֱלֹהֵי. The first אֱלִי is in one sense dittographic.—M עֹבְתֵי נֶפֶשׁ. Read עֹבֶת נֶפֶשׁ (cp. lxxxviii. 15). נֶפֶשׁ written in a shortened form, or else half-effaced, was taken for the suffix נִי. On the origin of *αφθαιρεῖ* in D of Mt. xxvii. 46 and Mk. xv. 34 see Chase, *Syro-Lat. Text of Gospels* ('95), 107; König, *Exp. T.*, Feb. 1900, 237 ff.

3 f. מִרְחוֹק מִיְשׁוּעָתִי דְּבַרִּי שְׁאֲנִתִּי, 'far from my deliverance are the words of my roaring;' so G 'A Σ Θ E' S' J T—a weight of authority by which Bā. feels overpowered (so Del., Kön. *Synt.* § 348σ); Bā., however, takes 'deliverance' = 'deliverer.' Most unnatural, even if we read רְחוֹקִים (cp. on cxix. 137). Read probably מְשֻׁמוֹעַ רְחוֹקִים.

<sup>1</sup>, written 'י, was absorbed by עֲתִי.

<sup>1</sup> Lagarde's detailed explanation of symbols (see on l. 25) reminds one of commentators' disputes on the first canto of Dante.

and **שֹׁאנָה** are elsewhere confounded (xxxii. 3; Job iii. 24). Street, Hi., Dy., Gr., Che<sup>(1)</sup>, We. read **מִשְׁוֹעָתִי** (cp. on lxxxviii. 2). This, however, does not fit in well.

6. M **וְלֹא דֹמִיָּה לִי**. G *καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἀνείαν ἐμὴ* (so Hatch, *Biblical Greek*, 191, rightly corrects *ἀνίουαν*), probably reading **רִמְיָה**, for elsewhere G decidedly does not recognise **דֹּמִיָּה**. The word **ד** is non-existent (see on xxxix. 3, lxii. 2, lxxv. 2). S here has **סֹלֶלְכָלִי** 'et non respicis.' This is but a guess. In xxxix. 3 **ד** has grown out of **תַּמִּיד**. This suggests **תָּרוֹם** for our passage. Cp. Isa. xxx. 18, 'he lifts himself not up to have compassion on you.' 'To lift oneself up,' = to interpose, with sovereign power, for the oppressed.

7 f. M **וְאַתָּה קָדוֹשׁ יוֹשֵׁב**. The moderns mostly make a stichus of the first two words (see Rahlfs below), but wrongly. G *ὁ εἰς ἐν ἁγίῳ κατοικεῖς*; S (Field) *ἐν ἁγίοις*. J 'et tu sancte habitator.' Halévy too and Duhm connect **יוֹשֵׁב** with **קָדוֹשׁ** (cp. Isa. lvii. 15). Bi., too weakly, inserts **יְהוָה** (metre). The only adequate remedy is to read **ק**

**ע**, with perhaps a fragment of **ק**, grew into **ש**.—M

Most moderns connect this with **יוֹשֵׁב**, and suppose that 'enthroned upon the praise-songs of Israel' is a spiritualizing development of the antique phrase 'enthroned upon the cherubim.' For an exposition of this view see my note in Ps.<sup>(1)</sup>, and *OP*, p. 327; cp. also especially Rahlfs, **עֲנִי וְעֲנִי** in *der Pss.*, pp. 35 ff. Rahlfs is very sure that M is correct, and defends the very short stichus **וְאַתָּה קָדוֹשׁ** by a reference to **וְאַתָּה הוּא**, cii. 28. All this is very questionable, and (so far as the development theory is concerned) too modern in spirit to be probable. It is only rendered necessary by the prevalent veneration for M's text, and is opposed to the tradition represented by G J (*ὁ ἔπαινος ἱσρ.*, *laus Israhel*). Hal. prefers to follow G J, but a line of two words, neither of which can have more than one beat, is intolerable. Gr. inserts **הַכְּרִיבִים** after **יוֹשֵׁב** and **נֹרָא** before **תְּהִלּוֹת**. This is regarded by Rahlfs as plausible, though unnecessary. But it gives us too much material; a shorter and simpler distich is required. Read **אֱלֹהֵי הַנּוֹחֶלֶת יֵשׁ** (see xxxix. 8; lxxi. 6c; cix. 2, corr. text). **אֱלֹהֵי** fell out, through its resemblance to **תְּהִלּוֹת**. As a postscript, I mention Herz's **ת' יוֹשֵׁב בֵּית ת'**, Winckl.'s **קְהִלַּת יוֹשֵׁב**, and Duhm's **בְּדָ תְּהִלַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּדָ** ('Israel's praise is of thee').

16 f. M **יַפְטִירוּ**; 'they cause to break through,' or 'they release (insults)'? Surely not. Read **יַפְעִירוּ** (Gr.); see Job xvi. 10.—M **גַּל אֶל־**, inf. abs. from **גָּלַל** (Kön., *Synt.*, 114, n. 2), or imper. kal. (Ol., Del., Bā., &c.). G S J, Bi., Bā., Du. **גַּל אֶל־** (G *ῥαλπισεν*; Mt. xxvii. 43,

We., יָנַל אֶל־. But an accusat. is indispensable, and whichever of the above readings we adopt, the sentence is rough, and the parallelism incomplete. Briill suggested יִנְאַלְהוּ; Hal. נִאֲלוּ (so Che., *JQR*, Oct. '97, 13; *Jew. Rel. Life*, 120); Wi. דִּנְל אֶל־ (against this see Che., *JQR*, Jan., '99, 236). One fault common to all these suggestions is the not taking account of יְהוָה. The covenant-name of God is not to be expected here. The correction which alone does perfect justice to the textual phenomena is אֶל יִנְאַלְהוּ. אֶל was misplaced, and hence misread אֶל. יְהוָה includes both the preformative and the affirmative of יִנְאַלְהוּ. Cp. on xxxvii. 9a.

19. Two plain corrections. נְחִי and (lxxi. 6) נְחִי are both fragments of מִחֲסִי; ח and ג, ס and ז confounded. (But in Mic. iv. 10 נְחִי should be הֲאֵנִחִי, Gr.). Also for מִבְּשִׁחִי read מִבְּשָׁחִי (G S J, Gr., We.); see lxxi. 5.

21, 23. M's הִשְׁלַכְתִּי is most unnatural. Read נִסְמַכְתִּי (see on lxxi. 6). Less probable is הוּחַלְתִּי, or (Wi.) הִשְׁלַמְתִּי (Job v. 23). The latter should mean 'I have been made thy friend.'—Insert יְהוָה (metre).

25. M פָּרִים רַבִּים. 'Many bulls'! Most improbable and against analogy. Read certainly (or רְאִמִּים בְּבִירִים (see on ll. 37 f., and on lv. 19). Wi., כְּפִירִים רַבִּים with just discernment of the problem. The *re'emim* must have been mentioned before l. 48.

26. M אֲבִירֵי בָשָׁן. In lxviii. 16, 23, 'Bashan' is due to corruption. So here. As Wi. points out, 'the cows of Bashan are symbols of fatness, never of strength.' But Wi.'s reading, אֲבִירֵי הַשָּׁן is not quite satisfactory; read בִּקְרָנֵי שָׁן (see l. 48). א and ק confounded. G (*ταῦροι*)

s, *i.e.* either דָּשָׁן or שָׁמָן; see G, lxviii. 16.—M בְּתִרְוִנִי, 'surround me'? So *e.g.* BDB, citing Judg. xx. 43, Hab. i. 4. But in Judg. read (Moore; cp. G), and in Hab. מַחֲרִיד (Gr.). Here certainly read

The lexicon gains. בָּתַר, Job xxxvi. 2, = 'to wait.'

27. Read טֹרְפִים וְשֹׂאֲנִים

29. M נִשְׁפַּכְתִּי. The par. passage, Lam. ii. 11, suggests that a noun should stand here. Read probably מִעֵי נִשְׁפַּכְתִּי. A play on מֵיִם and

33. Note Pasek. M בַּחֲרֵשׁ. Read בַּחֲצִיר (cf. cii. 5).—M בָּחִי. Read חָפִי (an early emendation, see Ibn Ezra), with Ol., Ew., Bā., &c.; cf. lxix. 4.

34. M וְלִשׁוֹנִי מִדְּבַק מִלְּקוּחִי. But 'ל' is fem.; 'מִדְּ' requires בּ or

ל after it; and מל' should mean 'tongs' or 'snuffers.' Read יי

35 (v. 17c). בְּאֵרֵי יְדֵי יְרֵנָלִי (some copies and edd. בְּאֵרֵי). On the other hand, some edd. have as Kr. בְּאֵרֵי, and some MSS. and the Complut. ed. have בְּאֵרֵי = בְּרוּ. The Vss. mostly presuppose some verb; G ὠρυξαν, 'A ἐπέδησαν (?) and ἤσχυον (two editions?), S כּוּצוּ, J vinxerunt. Σ, however, gives ὡς λέων (for proof, see Taylor, *Genizah Palimpsests*), and T the conflate rend., נִכְתִּין הֵיד כְּאֵרִיא, 'they bite like a lion.' On these renderings cp. Bā., *Jahrb. f. prot. Th.*, 1882, p. 27; Del., *Complutens. Varianten* (1878), p. 27; Zenner, 'Textkrit. Bemerk.,' *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1900, pp. 174 ff. It is not fruitful to discuss what readings (other than כְּאֵרִי or כְּאֵרוּ) the translators may have had in *their minds*. T, for instance, suggests עֲרָקָה (Job xxx. 17); S suggests קָרָה. But the rends. are but guesses. Many moderns, from De Rossi onwards, claim the *exigentia loci* as a decisive proof of the reading כְּאֵרוּ; Bā. and Now. add that in all probability the extant Heb. MSS. should only count as *one* witness, being all apparently derived from a single archetype. Lag., however (*Orientalia*, ii. 64), is confident that v. 17 is misplaced, and stood originally between v. 14 and v. 15. If this be correct, we have two stanzas, each consisting of seven stichi (viz. vv. 13, 14, 17 and vv. 15, 16), and, if we read כְּאֵרִי in v. 17c, we obtain a parallel for the אֵרִיא [כ] in v. 14b. But (1) it is obvious that as a rule the stanzas have eight lines, and it is practically certain that the three stichi grouped in M T of v. 16 should rather be four; (2) the exegetical difficulties of v. 17c are not removed by Lagarde. Wellh. tries to improve upon Lagarde by placing v. 17 (except c, which, with Olsh., he relegates to the margin) after v. 13. He thus obtains a somewhat better connexion for v. 18, and makes the פָּצוּ of v. 14 intelligible. The objections to this plan are (1) that it makes seven stichi, (2) that הִפָּה in v. 18b is too far removed from the descriptive title to which it points. The view of Ol. just referred to need not, in my opinion, be discussed; it is the resource of despair. Before mentioning what I venture to think the true reading, I am bound to record some earlier conjectures. The simplest plan is, with Kön. (*Synt.*, p. 681), or we might say, with Σ, to read בְּאֵרִי, unless, with Pococke and Reinke, we regard כְּאֵרִי as defectively written for כְּאֵרִים. The next easiest conjecture is that of Herz, נִקְרִי (Job xxx. 17). In 1888 I gave a qualified preference to Brüll's בְּתָרִי, 'surround' (cf. Ju. ix. 31, תְּרוּמָה for אֲרוּמָה), since proposed anew by Perles and Winckler. But 'surround' is imaginary (see on l. 26). Gr. and Hal. adopt the old guess אֵסְרוּ; Kr., Dy. בְּאֵבִי; Duhm בְּאֵרִי. All this proceeds on the mistaken assumption that the error lies solely in בְּאֵרִי. The whole line is corrupt, and the correction must be sought for in one of the parallel passages—

lix. 4; for plainly the throat had to be mentioned somewhere. The archetypal MS. was correct in rejecting ו as the final letter. It also gave the first word very nearly right, but erred in retaining **יְדִי וְרַגְלִי**, which, indeed, on all the theories as yet proposed, is unexpected, unnatural. Read **בְּקִרְאִי נָחַר נְרָנִי**. Plainly this belongs with the other descriptive clauses referring to parts of the body, and all that is now needed is to correct another suspicious clause (v. 16c) so as to provide a parallel for it. Let us see whether our wish can justly be gratified. (The order 16a, 16b, 17c, 16c is Bickell's.)

• 36. M gives, as v. 16c, **וְלַעֲפָר־מֹת תִּשְׁפָּתֵנִי**. The 'dust of Death-land' is not an impossible expression. In ed. I I compared *Descent of Istaṣ*, l. 8, 'the place where much dust is their food.' But **עֶפֶר** would have quite sufficed; the addition of **מֹת** is unnecessary (see on xxx. 10). **תִּשְׁפָּתֵנִי** must be wrong; if 'thou wilt place me' is the meaning, a commoner word would certainly have been chosen (see lxxxviii. 7). The tense too is surprising, and, lastly, there is no clause anywhere to which it (v. 16c) can be regarded as parallel. The text is wrong; can we correct it? Yes, if we may combine it with another clause which lacks a parallel, viz. 17c. The mention of the throat suggests that of the eye, and at once one remembers Job xvi. 16, **וְעַל-עֵפֶפַי צִלְמוֹת**. This is the original reading here. **מֹת** is dittographic. **תִּשְׁ** comes from **צִל** transposed; **פֶּת = מֶת**; **נִי = מִי** is dittographic.

37. Omit **כִּי** (dittogr., **נִי** precedes in M), and insert **רִבִּים** (G κύνες πολλοί) as part of the traditional text). On this we have now to operate. We do not want the 'dogs.' In *OP*, 232, I described Lag.'s symbolic explanation of the different animals (*Or*, ii. 64) as 'plausible'; I fear I must retract this. There is no parallel (see on lix. 7) for the use of the pariah-dogs of Eastern cities as a symbol for the enemies of Israel, and in the last extant couplet of Ps. xxii.<sup>(1)</sup> only lions and wild oxen are referred to. Read **לְבָאִים בְּבִירִים** (cp. on lix. 7). Wi., **בְּלָאִים**, 'jailers'; hardly. J 'venatores,' following 'A Θ (so Hieron. in *Anecd. Maredsol.*), = **בְּלָבִים**.

38. M **עֵדֶת מְרָעִים**. Against context and parallelism. Read certainly **מִרְאִים** (l. 48). So **רֵאמִים** in Isa. xxxiv. 7 should be **מִרְאִים**.

39. M **אֶסְפֵּר כָּל-עֲצָמוֹתַי**. The idea of being reduced to a skeleton would not have been so expressed. Nor is the *idea* of 'reckoning up my wounds' (another reading) a probable one. Read **בְּשָׂרִי כָּלָה מֵעֲצָבוֹתַי**. **עֲצָבוֹתַי** is right (T, Gr., Wi.), but the corruption lies deeper than Gr. supposes. (**עֲצָמִי** in error for **עֲצָבִי** occurs in Job vii. 15.)

40. M **יְבִיטוּ יְרֹאֲרֵבִי**. The idea of gloating on sufferings is both autologically expressed, and unsuitable to the parallelism. Read



יִבְעָטוּ בְּמִכָּאֲבִי (Dt. xxxii. 15; in 1 S. ii. 29 the reverse change is required; see Klo.).

41 f. Read :—

יִתְּלֵכֵנוּ בְּגָדִים לָהֶם  
וְלַעֲמַל נַפְשִׁי יִלְעִינוּ

M is most unsuitable. The error, יפילו גורל, in *l.* 42 closely resembles that in Ob. 11, ידו גורל, for יגדילו, *i.e.* ילְעִינוּ.

44. M אִילֹתַי : G ἡ βοήθεια μου. Lag. (*Or.* ii. 7) explains this ἀπ. λεγ. as an Aramaism. But if so, why not simply אֵילִי (see on lxxxviii. 5)? Such forms in וֵת are no doubt characteristically late ('lateborn linguistic expedient,' Kön. ii. 204), but this only explains how a scribe came to think of reading אִילֹת; it does not justify us in accepting it as original. Read אֵילִי אֶתָּה (Gr.).

45 f. M מַחֲרֵב, against parallelism. Read certainly מַכְפִּיר (cf. on xvii. 13; lxxiv. 19).—M כָּלֵב יְחִידָתִי. Read לֵבִי [א] חֵיתִי. כָּלֵב is due to a harmonizing editor (see on *l.* 37). as יְחִידָה as a title for the soul is most unnatural. G even gives τῇ μονογενεῇ μου (so xxxv. 17), and so helped to produce an artificial sense, 'precious,' 'dearly beloved.' Observe that יְחִיד in xxv. 16, lxxviii. 7 is equally suspicious. Gr., We., agree as to חֵיתִי.

48. M רָמִים, G μονοκέρωτων. Defective form of רִאִמִּים (cf. on *l.* 38). La. (*Or.* ii. 64) alters to פְּרִים, because the wild ox is 'hardly a dangerous animal.' A mistake; see on xcii. 11. פְּרִים in *l.* 25 is wrong.—M עֲנִיתִנִּי. Is this a designed violation of parallelism, leading on to the second part of the psalm? It must be so, assuming the text to be right, if grammatical usage is to be followed, for עֲנִי cannot be a consecutive perfect (Ewald). But the grammarians (even Kau. in Ges.-K. § 119 ff) are all too conservative. G τῇ ταπεινώσειν μου and Σ (Field) τ. κάκωσίν μ. read עֲנֹתִי or עֲנֹתִי (?) ; a guess. Thrupp, We. עֲנִיתִי. But the parallelism requires a verb. Read, not תַּעֲנִנִּי, but תַּשִּׁיבֵנִי (xxxv. 17).

## PSALM XXII.—2.

**T**RIMETERS. The Israel within Israel performs its vow of proclaiming God's faithfulness and reasserting the Messianic promise in the great assembly (cp. xl. 10 f., xxxv. 18 ?). Pss. xl.<sup>(2)</sup>, lxix.<sup>(2)</sup>, and cii.<sup>(2)</sup> are parallel to xxii.<sup>(2)</sup> The nationalism of the psalm forbids us to suppose that it is merely an ordinary liturgical formula to be used by an individual when paying his vows in the temple, or to be sung in his name by the temple singers. Duhm, who holds this poor theory, refers to Job xxxiii. 26–28 and Ps. lxi. 13–20. But in Job *l.c.* he adheres to the difficult

reading **יִשָּׁר**, in spite of the *Paseḵ* which follows it, vainly attempting to remove the difficulty by pointing **יִשָּׁר**, 'sings'; and though the writer of *lxvi.* 13 ff. may be a full believer in animal sacrifices, he cannot have intended his work for the use of an individual (see introd. to *lxvi.*<sup>(2)</sup>). Both in *xxii.*<sup>(2)</sup> and in *lxvi.*<sup>(2)</sup> the background is that of the N. Arabian oppression of Israel.

- 1 I will discourse of thy glory to my brethren, 23  
 In the midst of the assembly will I praise thee.  
 Ye that fear Yahwè, praise him ; 24  
 All ye of Jacob's offspring, honour him.<sup>1</sup>  
 • For he has not despised [his prisoners], 25  
 Nor rejected the cry of the sufferer ;  
 He has not hidden his face from him,  
 But when he called unto him, he heard.  
 • His faithfulness I will not conceal in the great assembly, 26  
 10 My vows will I perform before his worshippers,  
 Hope on, ye sufferers ! and ye shall rejoice, 27  
 Let those that are zealous for Yahwè praise him.  
 The Jerahmeelites shall seek eagerly for Yahwé, 27 (end), 28  
 The Ishmaelites shall do obeisance before him,  
 All the princes of Miṣṣur shall do obeisance, 30  
 Before him shall all Arabians kneel.  
 The offspring [of Jacob] shall honour him, 31  
 His worshippers shall declare his righteousness ;  
 They shall relate to the next generation  
 20 That he has wrought [for us] deliverance from Jerahmeel.

1-8. When the Messianic deliverance has taken place, the Israel within Israel (*i.e.* the 'Servant of Yahwè,' or the association of strictly pious Jews) will summon their 'brethren' (*i.e.* faithful Israel at large) to join them in praising God for his great deeds. *Ye that fear Yahwè.* Probably there is here no real antithesis to the 'seed of Israel,' as if proselytes were meant. In *xv.* 4, *lxvi.* 16, **יְרֵא יְהוָה** is simply a term for worshippers of Yahwè.—*Prisoner, sufferer*, collective terms (*cp.* *lxix.* 34).

9. Closely parallel to *xl.* 11.—10. *My vows*, &c. In the light of *cxix.* 31 f. we see that the 'vows' consisted in songs of praise. *Cp.* *l.* 14, *lvi.* 13, *lxi.* 9, *lxv.* 2, *cxvi.* 14.—11 f. The deliverance is only real to faith. Hence the Israel within Israel, addressing all

who have learned the true lesson of suffering, bids them 'hope on,' and the time for rejoicing will come. *Cp.* *lxix.* 33.

13-20. The grounds of this confidence. The Messianic promise is certain ; the most bitter of the foes of Israel will recognize that Yahwè alone has divine power, and accept him as their sovereign. And for itself Israel anticipates that its work of praise will never end. Age after age the message will be handed on that Yahwè delivered his people from its most cruel foe. *Cp.* *xlvi.* 14, *lxxi.* 18, *cii.* 19. — The editorial reconstructions of corrupt passages are of great interest. One of them (in *v.* 30, rightly read) implies the hope of the resurrection (*cp.* *Dan.* *xii.* 2). See crit. notes.

<sup>1</sup> And be afraid of him, all ye of Israel's offspring.

*Critical Notes.* 4. Omit last stichus of M (a variant).—5 f. Insert **אֶת־אֲסִירִי** (lxix. 34).—M **עֲנִית**, *ἀπ. λεγ.*, and unsuitable as the object of **שָׁקַן**; cp. ix. 13, cii. 18. Read **צַעֲקַת**. So the present writer in *JBL*, xv. (1896), p. 198; cp. We., *Skizzen*, vi. 170. **צ** precedes; **נו** comes from an imperfect *κ. G τῇ δέήσει* = **רָנַנִּי**.—9. M **מֵאֲתֶךָ**, 'caused by thee' (cxviii. 23)? Impossible. Read **אֲמַתִּי** (Gr., *אמתך*). **ו** fell out; **כ** belongs to the next phrase.—M **תִּהְיֶה־לִּי**. Read (taking over **כ**) **לֹא־כִחַדְתִּי** (xl. 11).

11. M **וַיִּשְׁפְּעִי**. But if the figure of the great Feast (xxiii.' 5) had been introduced, more would have been made of it. A reference to sacrifices is precluded by a couplet in a parallel psalm (lxix. 32). 'Comparing lxix. 33 (corr. text), read **וַיִּשְׁמַחִי**. For construction see xxxiv. 6 and xl. 4 (corr. text). Note Pasek.

13 f. M's **לְבַבְכֶּם לְעֹז** is an editorial expansion of a corruption of **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**. **וַיִּשְׁבְּרוּ** and **וַיִּשְׁחָרוּ** are two competing variants (note Pasek); read **וַיִּשְׁחָרוּ**.—**כָּל־אֶפְסֵי אָרֶץ** is probably another editorial expansion; the original text must have had **כָּל־יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים**; **אָרֶץ** was perhaps attached after **אֶפְסֵי** had grown out of **שְׁמַאי**. The verb to which 'כל יש' belongs is **יִשְׁתַּחֲווּ**. For **לִפְנֵי** read **לִפְנֵי**, with Vss., except T, and Houb., Horsley, Halévy. Cp. Duhm. **כָּל־מִשְׁפַּחֹת** is analogous to **כָּל־אֶפְסֵי**, i.e. it represents 'כל־יש'; **נֹוִים** is the editor's addition.—At this point in M (v. 29) comes a collection of corruptions of ethnics, viz. **כִּי לַיהוָה** = **יִרְחַמְאֵל**; **הַפְּלוּכָה** also = 'ירח' (so in Ob. 21; see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Obadiah'); **וּמוֹשֵׁל** = **יִשְׁמַעְאֵל**; **בְּנֹוִים** = **יִרְחַמְאֵל**. Most textual critics simply insert **הוּא** (**וְהוּא מוֹשֵׁל**) *הוא*; so G, *καὶ αὐτὸς δεσπότης*. But the whole of v. 29 is weak.

15. M **אָכְלוּ**; G *ἔφαγον*. Most (Pinsker, Bruston, Gr., Du., &c.) read **לֹא**. Experience, however, warns us to reject slight remedies in such a corrupt passage. Beyond doubt, **אָכְלוּ** is a corrupt fragment of **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**, originally perhaps a correction referring to our l. 13. **דַּשְׁנ־אָרֶץ** is also clearly wrong. Brüll suggests **שִׁכְנִי**, Smend and Renan **יִשְׁבִּי**, Kr. **יִשְׁנִי**, which We. does not indeed adopt, but considers to have been an early error, which produced the 'gloss' **לֹא חָיָה**; **וּנִפְשׁוּ**; Duhm **רָשִׁי** ('poor'). **אָרֶץ**, however, must be an ethnic, viz. either **אֲשׁוּר** = **נִשְׁוֹר** or **מִצְוֹר**. The latter is the more probable (cp. on ii. 10). **דַּשְׁנִי** can now be corrected into **רִזְנִי**. Read **כָּל־רִזְנִי מִצְוֹר**.

16. M **כָּל־יִוְרֵי עָפָר**. Probably suggested by the false reading **יִשְׁנִי** (above). But an ethnic is wanted. Possibly 'י' and 'ע' both represent

corruptions of עֲרִבִים (cp. lxxii. 9, corr. text).—The impossible words חִיה וּנְפֹשׁוּ represent another group of ethnics. וּנְפֹשׁוּ (G S imply וּנְפִישִׁי) comes from יִשְׁמְעָאל, and חִיה לא חִיה from יִרְחִמָּאל. Originally perhaps corrections. נ miswritten for ל, פ for מ are frequent; so also is the prefixing of the second part of a corrupted word.

17 f. Between זָרַע and יַעֲבֹדְנִי something has fallen out. T gives זָרַע יַעֲקֹב; G Θ read זָרַעִי (so Houb., Bā.). Rather זָרַע יַעֲקֹב (cp. l. 4). So Du., who continues 'עַבְי יִשְׂרָאֵל יַעֲבֹדְנִי; but the parallelism of יַעֲבֹד and 'עַבְי is imperfect. That כ and ע are confounded is certain (e.g. כָּל and עָל). Moreover, from our metrical point of view, we cannot afford to insert so much. For l. 18 we must utilize יִבְאוּ וַיִּנְדְּרוּ יִבְאוּ, only יִבְאוּ seems to have no special force. Read, for ו יִבְאוּ, וַיִּנְדְּרוּ.

19. Wellh. suggests זָרַע עֲבָדָיו יִסְפֹּר לְאֹדְנִי לְדֹר יִבָּא. This stichus is of course not to the taste of metrists. לְדֹר יִבָּא (G γεγενῆσθαι ἢ ἐρχομένην) is adopted by Bā., Che.<sup>(1)</sup> Du., but is not a probable idiom here; besides, Duhm's reading ('יִסְפֹּר וְנִי) produces a tetrameter. Read probably יִסְפֹּרוּ לְדֹר אַחֲרוֹן. The letters אֹדְנִי represent אֲרֹנוּ, a mutilated אַחֲרוֹן (cp. cii. 19). The scribe wrote 'לֹאח in error, and therefore supplemented it by לְדֹר.

20. M לָעַם נֹלָד, i.e. to the people that shall be born (G J). The critics accept this, comparing the 'imitation' עַם נִבְרָא in cii. 19. Both phrases are questionable, and if genuine would have been elucidated by the author. Comparing Dt. xxxii. 6 f., we should rather expect them to refer to ancient Israel (Dt. xxxii. 6 f.), not to the children of living Israelites. נֹלָד surely comes from רָמַל, and לָעַם from מָאֵל; both are fragments of יִרְחִמָּאל. In Isa. xxxviii. 15, xlv. 23, עֲשֵׂה is a corruption of הוֹשִׁיעַ. For similar necessary corrections see Ps. xxxvii. 5, lii. 11, Isa. lxiv. 3 (the only passage where Duhm notices this). Here, however, it is best to read כִּי מִיִּרְחִמָּאל הִשְׁיִעֵנִי.

## PSALM XXIII.

PENTAMETERS. A composite psalm, framed on the model of xxii. In xxii.<sup>(1)</sup> Israel was opposed by lions, and seemed to have no helper. In xxiii.<sup>(1)</sup> he is too happy in the felt presence of his Guide to dread even the darkest ravine (צִלְמוֹת) in xxiii. 4 and in xxii. 16 corr. text). In xxii.<sup>(2)</sup> God's sufferers look forward to a feast (v. 27); in xxiii.<sup>(2)</sup> the community pictures this feast with delight. It is the Messianic feast, as in xxxvi.<sup>(2)</sup>, which is referred to; the corrected text of *Il.* 1, 2

makes this clear. As in Isa. xxv. 6, the feast is spread in Zion, *i.e.* in the temple-courts, and as in Ps. xxvii. 5 the speaker's one desire is to be sheltered for ever in that home of peace. Who is the speaker? In xxiii.<sup>(2)</sup> Israel as a matter of course. There can be no private feast in the kingdom of God; this is one of the 'Guest-psalms' (*OP*, 236). In xxiii.<sup>(1)</sup>, as the text stands, there is nothing to prevent a primary reference to the second or idealized David, *i.e.* the Messiah; in xviii. this personage (probably) gives thanks for his deliverance from the darkness of Death-land. But there is also nothing to suggest this. In lxxx. 2 Yahwè is called the "shepherd of Israel," and repeatedly the same figure is expressed or implied (see on *L* 1 f.; Isa. xl. 11 is specially parallel). The shepherd's tending, moreover, is said to be 'for his name's sake,' and his full name is 'Yahwè the God of Israel.' But of course a secondary reference would have been permitted by the poet to the individual, in so far as his joys and sorrows arose out of his position as an Israelite, *i.e.* in so far as he lived to show forth God's glory (cf. Isa. xliij, 7). See the fine description of a 'lamb of God' in *Ecce Homo*, ed. 2, p. 8. אֵלֹהֵינוּ

For the national reference see the Targum, Theod. Mops. (in *ZATW*, '85, p. 94), Kimhi, Hengstenb., Ol., Reuss, Smend, Cheyne, Bâ., Coblenz, &c. The composite origin has been maintained by von Ortenberg (*ZATW*, '87, p. 308) and Fripp (*JQR*, 1892, p. 672). The latter well says, 'The table, the oil, the cup, the temple, have nothing to do with the shepherd life of 1-4, and the divine goodness and mercy that follow (6) are not the care and guidance that lead (1-4).' Probably the small fragment which constitutes xxii.<sup>(1)</sup> was felt to require a supplement.

## XXIII.—I.

*Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.*

I

1 Yahwè is the shepherd [of Israel]; | [no good thing] do I lack.

In [a place of] tender grassy pastures— | there he makes me lie down.

2

To fountains of living water | [Yahwè] leads me to drink;  
He guides me in the paths that are right | for his name's sake.

3

Even if I walk through a glen darksome as Hades, | I fear no hurt;

4

[? Neither lion nor young lion do I dread?] for thou art with me.

Thy pastoral rod, thy staff, | that tranquillizes me.

XXIII.—2. (*Fragment.*)

1 Before me thou arrangeest a table | within thy courts; 5  
My desire thou satisfiest with rich foods, | my cup thou fillest to the brim.

Surely goodness and loving-kindness will attend me | all my life long;

6

And I shall dwell in Yahwè's house | for endless days.

1 f. The Vg. gives 'Dominus regit me'; hence the Wycliffite, 'The Lord governeth me'; an unconscious ratification of the true view of the psalm, as the utterance of the Israel within Israel. The text, however, is incomplete; it suffers from the same corruptness as the close of Ps. xxii.<sup>(2)</sup> *Line 1*, for instance, runs in M's text, 'Yahwè is my shepherd; I lack not,' which is very abrupt and incomplete, if we compare it with lines 3 and 4. The supplied words are only conjectural! The figure of the divine shepherd is no doubt an ancient one; the ruler is his people's shepherd. In Gen. xlviii. 15 the phrase 'the God who tended me' is put into the mouth of Israel's reputed ancestor (Israel, not Jacob); Gen. xlix. 15, however, is corrupt. As the shepherd of his people Yahwè is described in lxxiv. 1, lxxix. 13, xcvi. 7, c. 3; cp. xxviii. 9, lxxvii. 21, lxxviii. 52, lxxx. 2, Is. xl. 11, lxiii. 13 f., Jer. xxxi. 9, Ezek. xxxiv. 41, Mic. vii. 14.

See introd.—דְּשָׁאֵן denotes the quality of the young sprouts of grass—sappy, green, tender (cp. 'Grass,' *Enc. Bib.*). In Joel ii. 22 דְּשָׁאֵן should be rendered 'sprout luxuriantly,' not 'become green.'

3. f. **Living waters, מֵיִם חַיִּים** (12 times in O.T.) properly = springing water (so Gen. xxvi. 19, RV), but wells being so often sacred to some supernatural being (W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, 135, 166), late writers could use 'springing water' as a symbol of the blessings promised by their religion (see on xxxvi. 10, and cp. John iv. 10 f.). Such a symbolic use is in-

dicated here by the parallel line. דָּק מַעְנֵל צֶדֶק means, not only 'straight paths,' but 'paths of (religious) rightness,' or, as above, *paths that are right*. The same phrase occurs probably in xxxii. 8 and lxvii. 5 (corrected texts); cp. also Prov. iv. 11, where דָּרֶךְ חֲכָמָה corresponds to מַעְנֵל יֵשֶׁר, i.e. paths of uprightness (in daily life). The 'right paths,' then, are the courses of action prescribed by God's law, of which it is said (xix. 8) that it 'revives the soul.' If Israel walks steadily in these paths, it will be rewarded by the sense of God's favour, and sooner or later by material goods. The ethical and the material sense may not yet be sharply distinguished, but we can see that the ethical sense is destined to become the exclusive one.—*For his name's sake*, i.e. as the God of Israel; cp. Isa. lxiii. 16, 19.

5. **צִלְמוֹת**, a favourite word in Job (iii. 5, x. 21 f.) for deep darkness like that of Sheol. Cp. xviii. 6b (corr. text), xlv. 20, cvii. 10, 14.

xxiii.<sup>(2)</sup> 1 f. See especially xxxvi. 9, Isa. xxv. 6 (cp. introd.).—4. The individual cannot dwell in Yahwè's house for ever, but the community can. The psalmist thinks in the first instance of Yahwè's house on Mount Zion. There Israelites can best learn what communion with Yahwè means. But there is a greater Israel beyond the limits of Palestine. A larger conception of 'Yahwè's house' and of communion with God could not therefore help being formed. Cp. *OP*, 387 f., *JRL*, 251 ff.

מֵיִם לְאָרֶץ יָמִים, as xciii. 5, Lam. v. 20. Cp. xxi. 5.

**Critical Notes.** 1. Read רֵעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (lxxx. 2). 'יש' was probably omitted through its resemblance to לֹא אֲחֹסֶר; probably the letters had been mixed up. Also insert כָּל-טוֹב (xxxiv. 11) or טוֹב. Change from objective to personal form of statement, as in cxxi.; 'Israel's keeper' (v. 4), then 'Yahwè is thy keeper, [O Israel],' v. 5.

2. Read 'ד' בְּמִקּוֹם נ'; G εἰς τόπον γλῶσς. Then insert שָׁם; G ἐκεῖ. Metre.

3. M עַל-מִי מְנַחֵת יְנַהֲלֵנִי : נִפְשִׁי יִשׁוּבָב. This might perhaps do for a line, were it not for the superfluous second verbal clause, which prevents perfect parallelism with ll. 2, 4. There are also exegetical difficulties.

'יש' is indeed plain enough; the spokesmen of the community continually ask to have their 'breath brought back' to them, to be refreshed or revived (see on lx. 3). But what does 'מִי מֵן' mean? 'Water of rest'? The plural *might* be abstract (so G K, § 124e). But what a vague expression! Does it mean gently-flowing water? or water by which one can rest? or, taking the plural strictly, water with resting-places? For this sense of 'מ' cf. Nu. x. 33, 'the ark . . . went before them . . . to seek out a resting-place (מנוחה) for them.' The two latter explanations are preferable. The idea of tranquil waters would have been expressed differently (cp. Isa. viii. 6), nor was there any object in mentioning the calmness of the waters; the dangers of the flock arose from wild beasts, not from rough waters. But has not enough been said in l. 2 of the choice of spots to rest in? If, however, this objection be overruled, we still have to justify ינהלני. Friedr. Del. (*Prolog.*, 17 ff.) thinks that the sense required is 'he makes me to lie down,' and—to suit this and other passages (more especially Gen. xlvii. 17, 2 Chr. xxviii. 15, xxxii. 22)—compares נהל with Ass. *na'ûlu*, a synonym of *rahâsu*, 'to lie down.' Craig (*Hebraica*, Oct. '93, p. 80) and R. D. Wilson (*Presb. Rev.*, Apr. '85, pp. 319 ff., where two roots נהל are assumed) have more or less followed Del.; Kau. (*Th. LZ*, Oct. 30, '86) rejects his view after an examination of the passages, which, though careful, is not keen enough in its criticism. Though agreeing with Kau.'s result, I am obliged to re-examine the passages. Observe, then, first, that G gives in Ps. xxiii. 3 and in Gen. xlvii. 17 ἐξέθρεψεν; in Ps. xxxi. 4 διαθρέψεις. In Gen. l.c. at any rate (see Ball in *SBOT*) and in Ps. xxxi. 4 G is right; we have to read תכלכלני. In 2 Chr. xxxii. 22 G has κατέπαυσεν (cp. xiv. 6, xv. 15, xx. 30); read וינח להם (so J, Bertheau, Kittel, &c.); and in xxviii. 15 we should read almost certainly (without G's help) ויכלכלום. There still remain Ex. xv. 13, Ps. xxiii. 2, Isa. xl. 11, xlix. 10, li. 18, and (התנ') Gen. xxxiii. 14. In all these passages, unless indeed Ps. xxiii. 2 be an exception, the sense 'to lead' or 'lead gently' (as a flock is led to drink) is satisfactory. I admit that, if we keep the text of Ps. xxiii. 2, the sense 'to lead' is inadequate. But the sense 'to support' or 'nourish' (G), derived from יכל, is equally so. Therefore מִי מְנַחֵת (itself not a satisfactory phrase) must be wrong. We naturally look for help to II. Isaiah, this being a Deut.-Isaianic psalm. Isa. xlix. 10 contains the promise וְעַל-מְבוּעֵי מַיִם יְנַהֵלֵם. Now we have recovered the word which restores perfect sense, and we can also get rid of the troublesome little clause נַפְשִׁי יִשׁוּבָב. The word is מְבוּעֵי; נַפְשִׁי and יִשׁ are both miswritten forms of this word; יִשׁ may have been originally a *correction* of the already corrupt word which preceded it. Read, as l. 3, וְעַל-מְבוּעֵי מַיִם חַיִּים יְהִי יְנַהֵלֵנִי. יְהִי, represented perhaps by י, would easily fall out. מַיִם חַיִּים is accounted for

thus. מ in מנחות is the last letter of מים ; נ and ו both represent י ; the final ת, as so often, has arisen out of ם. חיים is not authorized by II. Isaiah, but is an improvement (see above).

7. Prefix conjecturally מֵאֲרִי מִכְפִּיר לֹא־אֲדָג, suggested by Ps. xxii.

8. M יִנְחֵנִי. But one who has such a Guide has nothing to sorrow for. Read יִנְחֵנִי (cf. on cxxxviii. 7) ; Isa. xiv. 3 is just parallel. נוח and נחם confounded, as in Gen. v. 29 (see Ball), and the passages cited by Nestle in *Exp. T.*, viii. 239, x. 48. Gr. הִנְחֵנִי (repetition ; see *l.* 4).

xxiii.<sup>(2)</sup> 1. M נִגְדַּ צְרָרִי. 'A very picturesque trait ! They must look on quietly, how the table is spread, and how the psalmist sits down at it' (Hengstenberg). Rather, a blot on the psalm, only to be tolerated under necessity. If נִגְדַּ is right, צְרָרִי must be wrong, because it is against parallelism. But נִגְדַּ, too, is wrong. Read בְּקֶרֶב הַצְרִיךְ. How constantly the psalmists localize their happiness thus ! So *l.* 1 corresponds to *l.* 4.

2. M דִּשְׁנָה. No great reliance can be placed on M in such a case as this. Read probably תִּדְשֵׁן (Gr.).—M רִאשִׁי. But the verb should be סוּד or (Am. vi. 6) מִשָּׁח. דִּשֵׁן is a special word of Proverbs (xi. 25, xiii. 4, xv. 30). In the two former passages it goes with נִפְשֵׁ. Read certainly נִפְשִׁי ; cf. on lxiii. 6 (same phrase). נ dropped out after the נ in שִׁמֵּן (final letters very slowly became the rule) ; פ and ר were confounded ; א was inserted by the editor.—M רוּיָה (ῥοιγ.). Read Cp. again on lxiii. 6.

M טוֹב. Point טוֹב, to match חסד (xxv. 7).

4. M וּשְׁבַתִּי, implying a wrong exegetical view (cf. T), unless we suppose the points to indicate a preference for the perf. of יִשָּׁב. Read (Gr., Kau., We. ; cf. S J).

## PSALM XXIV.

Two striking little chants (the latter incomplete) are here combined. Both are in trimeters, but while the first is in quatrains, the second is in triplets. Ps. xxiv.<sup>(1)</sup> is the counterpart of Ps. xv., except that it has what may be styled a theoretic introduction (*ll.* 1—4), which, it is barely possible, may have come from another hand. The chant describes the character which will be recognized by the divine Judge as a passport to Messianic blessedness. The theoretic basis is this. The God of Zion is also the creator and proprietor of the world. He is therefore not a God in the likeness of man, and cannot be hoodwinked or propitiated by the wicked. He is the Holy One, and requires holiness of his votaries, which includes the absolute renunciation of false gods, especially of the god of Jerahmeel (a lunar deity ? See *Crit. Bib.* on Zeph. i. 5).



Ps. xxiv.<sup>(2)</sup> is a companion-passage to Isa. lxiii. 1-6. The divine Warrior has either returned from his victory over his and Israel's enemies, and stands before the gates of Jerusalem, or is about to enter in triumph the chief city of the Jerahmeelites. It thus becomes needless to look out for a victory which may have been celebrated by the singing of this triumphal song, or to select one of the two reported post-exilic rededications<sup>1</sup> of the temple—that in B.C. 520 (Halévy, *Rev. sémit.*, Oct. 1894, p. 297) or that in B.C. 165 (Duhm). The temple indeed is not referred to at all, and though the psalm is a song of triumph, it is nothing less than the great Messianic victory that is meant.

Stade (*Akad. Reden.*, 70) endeavours to show that the division of the psalm into two independent songs is unnecessary. But all that he shows is that both passages have a broadly Messianic reference, *i.e.* that the editor had a good reason for combining them. In the revised text the combination is still more amply justified (note the reference in both passages to 'Jerahmeel').

The LXX. adds to the title τῆς μῆς σαββάτων, *i.e.* של אחד בשבת, 'of the first day of the week.' This is supported by the Jewish liturgy; cp. *Rosh ha-shanā*, 31a, where R. Akiba connects this assignment with the reference of the psalm to the creation. On the Christian application, see *OP*, 204, 223; *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 99-109.

## XXIV.—1.

*Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.*

- 1 Yahwè's is the earth and all that it contains;  
 The world, and those who dwell in it.  
 For he +alone+ founded it upon ocean, 2  
 And established it upon +ocean's+ streams.  
 Who may go up +to worship+ on Yahwè's mountain? 3  
 Or who may stand in his holy place?  
 He that has innocent hands and a pure heart, 4  
 That has not sworn to Jerahmeel;  
 He shall receive a blessing from Yahwè, 5  
 10 +Yea,+ a privilege from his delivering God;  
 Such a one shall lay low the wicked, 6  
 He shall trample on the profane ones of Jerahmeel.

## XXIV.—2.

*(The opening has fallen out.)*

- 7 Lift up your heads, ye gates,  
 +Yea,+ lift yourselves up, ye portals of Jerahmeel, 7  
 That the King of Glory may enter!  
 10 Who, oh who, is the King of Glory? 8  
 'Yahwè, the Strong One, the Hero,  
 Yahwè, the Hero in battle.'

<sup>1</sup> Hupfeld's supposition of a reference to the first (pre-exilic) dedication is quite out of the question. Not to press the phrase פתחי עולם (which seems to be corrupt), where is there any mention of the ark (cp. 1 K. viii. 3 ff.)?

Lift up your heads, ye gates, 9  
 +Yea,+ lift yourselves up, ye portals of Jerahmeel,  
 That the King of Glory may enter.

Who, oh who, is the King of Glory ? 10  
 'Yahwè, the God of Hosts,  
 18 He +alone+ is the King of Glory.'

6, 2. It is the privilege of Israel to have been brought into specially close contact with 'the everlasting God, Yahwè, the creator of the ends of the earth' (Isa. xl. 28). But who is the true Israelite? Both full-born Jews and (cf. Ps. lxxxvii.) proselytes need to know this, for Israel is growing out of a mere nation into a church. Those who enter the sacred precincts unbidden have good cause to fear, for this great God may hurl the thunders of his wrath upon them—nay, at a coming awful day, he *will* do so (see on v. 5-8; xv.).

3. **Ocean, יָם**, (see on viii. 9).

A 'mighty ocean' (Bab. *apsu daninu*) encompasses the earth. Contrast Job xxvi. 7, where God is said to have suspended the 'north' (see *Enc. Bib.*, col. 1149, {n.<sup>(1)</sup>} on space (תְּהוֹ הַבְּלִיַּים)). The psalmist's view is no doubt the earlier one. So cxxxvi. 6; cp. on civ. 5. —Streams, נְהָרוֹת. So xciii. 3; cf. נְחָלִי, xviii. 5; נָהָר (|| יָמִים), Jon. ii. 4. There is no sharp distinction between 'river' and 'sea' in Semitic; cp. *nāru marrātu*, 'the bitter stream' (see Del., *Par.* 182; *Enc. Bib.*, 'Mera-thaim'). Homer, too, calls the world-ocean ποταμός.

7 f. God can see the stains on the hands and heart (conscience) of a criminal. The true Israelite constantly keeps hands and heart clean (xxvi. 6, 10, lxxiii. 13). The imitator in Isa. xxxiii. 15 omits the heart, but adds ears and eyes. בְּרִלְבָב again in lxxiii. 1; cp. Job xvii. 9. Contrast Prov. xx. 9. —*Sworn to Jerahmeel*. The danger from Jerahmeelite idolatry was not confined to pre-exilic times. The power of Jerahmeel seemed to be a witness to his divinity.

10. **A privilege, צִדְקָה**, something that it is 'righteous' for him and not for others to receive, so perhaps Isa. liv. 17. There are Arabic and Iimyaritic parallels. G adopts another equally special sense, viz. 'a gift of mercy,' ἐλεημοσύνη (so Σ, xxx. 2, and another Greek version at cv. 3, cxii. 3).

11 f. In what does the privilege consist? In laying low the oppressor—the 'profane' Jerahmeelites.

xxiv.<sup>(2)</sup> 8. **Ye portals of Jerahmeel**. Does this mean the gates of Jerusalem, which was originally peopled by Jerahmeelites (see 2 S. v. 8, revised text), and in Isaiah's time could poetically be called 'Jerahmeel' (see Isa. xxix. 1, revised text, and *Crit. Bib.*)? or the chief city of the Jerahmeelites? Is the divine Warrior to be imagined at the end of his journey from the field of battle (cp. lxviii. 19)? or is he just about to occupy the conquered hostile city? Either view is possible, but the latter (cp. lx. 11) seems the more probable.

9 ff. **King of Glory**. The divine glory is meant (Isa. iv. 5, Ezck. iii. 23, &c.; cp. אֱלֹהֵינוּ, xxix. 3). The questioner in l. 10 is, not the personified gates (Bä.), but a bystander (cp. Isa. lxiii. 1 f.). The answer is given, not by an angelic choir (Theodoret), but by the poet, who is imaginatively present.—*The Hero*. Cp. lxxviii. 65, ciii. 20, Ex. xv. 3.

17. **Hosts, צְבָאוֹת**, i.e. perhaps all the supernatural or superhuman forces in the world in whom the Jews of the psalmist's age believed. Cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Amos,' 'Names of God.'

*Critical Notes.* xxiv.<sup>(1)</sup> 8. Omit אֲשֶׁר, editorial insertion. The following words, לֹא נִשָּׂא לְשׁוֹא נַפְשׁוֹ, not only afford a poor climax to l. 7, but contain a very doubtful idiom (cp. Hupf.-Nowack). After this comes another little clause, which, though inadequate as a climax, is better Hebrew. According to analogy, it may be regarded as a superior various reading. נִפְשׁוֹ and נִשָּׂא are both corruptions of an incompletely written נִשְׁבַּע. As to לְשׁוֹא and לְמַרְמָה it is no doubt plausible to view them as alternative and equivalent expressions. But much more probably לְשׁוֹא comes from לֹא נִשְׁבַּע, and לְמַרְמָה, as in cix. 2, &c., from יִרְחַמָּאל. 'Swearing to (or by) Jerahmeel' (the god of the Jerahmeelites) was a heinous offence (see *Crit. Bib.* on Zeph. i. 5). Read therefore וְלֹא נִשְׁבַּע לִירְחַמָּאל (a relative clause). [K<sup>r</sup>. נַפְשׁוֹ, though supported by MSS. and edd., and by Saad., Ibn Janah, Rashi, and Kimhī, has no critical value, being plainly suggested by Ex. xx. 7; see Bā.]

11 f. M פָּנֶיךָ יַעֲקֹב (Kt.), דְּרָשׁוֹ (K<sup>r</sup>.), and דְּרָשׁוֹ. Two doubtful phrases. The latter is supported by 'A Σ E' S' J and Vet. Lat.; S, however, inserts אֱלֹהֵי; while T reads פָּנֶי יַעֲקֹב, and G פָּנֵי אֱלֹהֵי י'. Houb. and most moderns follow S; Duhm prefers G; Whitehouse (after J. S. Bright) sees an allusion to Gen. xxxii. 31, and proposes כִּיעֲקֹב. The latter is a less superficial correction, but does not go to the heart of the problem. Evidently the mischief is centred in יַעֲקֹב, which is plainly corrupt. A corruption of what? The answer is suggested by l. 8. As in some other passages, יַעֲקֹב must have displaced יִרְחַמָּאל. דֹּר דְּרָשׁוֹ is also too improbable to stand. What we require in ll. 11 f. is a *description* of the blessing referred to in ll. 9 f. The text must have been nearly as follows: זֶה יָרִיד רְשָׁעִים וַיִּכְבַּשׁ חֲנָנִי יִרְחַמָּאל סֵלָה. at the end is no 'musical note' (G διάψαλμα), but a corruption of חֵמֶל = יִרְחַמָּאל (a correction perhaps of יַעֲקֹב). We shall often have a similar experience.

xxiv.<sup>(2)</sup> 8, 14. M פִּתְחֵי עוֹלָם, a vague expression, variously interpreted as 'ancient' (Ew., Del., Bā., &c.) and as 'everlasting doors' (G, J, Hengstenberg, Hupfeld). But what appropriateness has either title in this context? Perles (*Anal.*, 68) proposes פ' אֵילָם 'gates of the temple porch' (2 Chr. xxix. 7). This is in connexion with his theory that the psalm commemorates the restoration of the temple cultus by Hezekiah—a restoration of which we know nothing from trustworthy sources. In *Enc. Bib.*, col. 1409, note 1, I proposed פִּתְחֵי עֲלִיוֹן 'portals of the Most High,' comparing Gen. xxi. 33 (J<sup>(2)</sup>), where Abraham invokes Yahwè as אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם, which cannot possibly be correct, and is emended by Renan into אֱלֹהֵי עֲלִיוֹן. The two passages are no doubt analogous; but after completing my revision of Ps. lxxviii., I see that thorough criticism requires us to read in both passages neither עוֹלָם nor עֲלִיוֹן, but יִרְחַמָּאל, a word which we often meet with in mutilated fragments like עֵלֶם or אֵלֶם. See *exeg. note*.

## PSALM XXV.

QUATRAINS of trimeters. Each couplet of a quatrain begins with a letter of the alphabet, but there is no **י** couplet (cp. Ps. xxxiv.), and the **פ** couplet is only produced by a very plausible conjecture, for the text apparently gives two couplets for **י**, but none for **פ**. There is also (as in Ps. xxxiv.) a supernumerary **פ** couplet, which many suppose to be a liturgical appendix. It is certain, however, that we no longer have it in its integrity, because (1) the appendix is not in the metre of the psalm, (2) to use 'Elohim' instead of 'Yahwè' is not the want of the psalmist, and strange in Book i. of the Psalms, and (3) 'Israel' is nowhere else mentioned in the psalm. On the analogy of a late Jewish custom Lagarde<sup>1</sup> supposes the supernumerary couplets in Pss. xxv. and xxxiv. to be separate acrostics, indicating 'Pedahel' and 'Pedaiah' as the names of the respective writers (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Pedahel,' 'Pedaiah'). These couplets, however, admit of a safer explanation, not indeed as implying a difference of pronunciation between **פ** and **פ**,<sup>2</sup> but as completing the respective quatrains. Certainly the principle invoked by Lagarde might easily be carried to very inconvenient lengths, and produce very undesirable additions to the literary history of the Israelites.

The psalm is described by Bâthgen as 'a series of sayings with petitions for help against the enemies, guidance in the right way, forgiveness of sins, preservation, and liberation.' The second and third of these subjects have, if we adopt the revised text, to be omitted, and in their place instruction in the principles of Yahwè's dealings with Israel, and the punishment of the sins of Israel's oppressors should be introduced. The speaker is the pious Jewish community (cp. ll. 1, 3 with l. 5), or more strictly the inner circle within that community (see on Ps. xxxiv.). Note also (1) the phrase 'for the sake of thy name' (l. 21) the name intended is 'Yahwè, the God of Israel,' and (2) the epithet **חסיד** 'pious,' 'loyal' in l. 32 (revised text), cp. xvi. 10 b, lxxvi. 2 b. The apparent inconsistency in ll. 23-28 arose out of the exigencies of the acrostic form of composition. In ll. 2, 5 f., 9, 12, 13, 16, 22, 33, 37 f., 42, the most bitter national foes are mentioned by name.

*Of 'Arab-ethan.*

1

- 1 Unto thee, O Yahwè! do I cry,  
 [Preserve] my soul [from] the Ishmaelites.  
 In thee I trust, let me not be disappointed ; 2  
 Let not mine enemies deride me !  
 Yea, let those of Jerahmeel be disappointed, 3  
 Let the traitors of Jerahmeel turn back :  
 Thy ways, O Yahwè! cause me to know, 4  
 Teach me the paths that are thine.

<sup>1</sup> *Academy*, Jan. 1, 1872; *Symnikta*, 1877, p. 107. Rahlfs (עני and עני, p. 41), G. Hoffmann, and Duhm favour Lagarde. Cp., however, Geiger, *Jüd. Zte.*, x. (1872), pp. 133 ff., B. Jacob, *ZATW*, xvi. (1896), p. 153, note; Beer, *Indiv.-ps.*, p. 30; Cheyne, *OP*, 248.

<sup>2</sup> *Kön. Lehrgeb.*, i. 37. Jerome (on Dan. ii. 45) remarks, 'Notandum autem quod P literam Hebræus sermo von habeat, sed pro ipsa utatur Phe, cuius vim Græcum  $\Phi$  sonat'; i.e. his teachers did not distinguish between **פ** and **פ**. Cp. Grimm, *Liturg. App.*, 8 f.

- Cut off the Jerahmeelites for their wickedness, 5  
 10 For thou art my delivering God.  
 Remember thy compassion, O Yahwè ! 6  
 And hold back those of Jerahmeel.  
 The sins of<sup>1</sup> Ishmael do thou remember,<sup>2</sup>  
 Because of thy goodness, O Yahwè !  
 Good and upright is Yahwè ; 8  
 Therefore will he lay low Jerahmeel.  
 He leads the sufferers in the right course, 9  
 He teaches the poor his way :  
 All his paths are lovingkindness and faithfulness 10  
 20 To regards of his covenant and his admonitions.  
 For the sake of thy name, O Yahwè ! 11  
 Forgive not the iniquity of Jerahmeel.  
 Who is the man that fears Yahwè ? 12  
 Him will He instruct in the way that He chooses.  
 He himself will abide in prosperity, 13  
 And his offspring will inherit the land.  
 The secret of Yahwè is for those that fear Him, 14  
 And his blessing for those that love his name.  
 Mine eyes are ever toward Yahwè ; 15  
 30 It is he who will bring my feet out of the net.  
 Look towards me, and take pity upon me, 16  
 For I am one that is pious, one that suffers.  
 Those of Jerahmeel afflict me,  
 But do thou bring me out of my distresses !  
 Attentive be thine ears to my weeping, 18  
 And hear the sound of my sighs !  
 Behold those of Jerahmeel, 19  
 And those of Ishmael and of Cush :  
 Preserve my soul, and deliver me ; 20  
 40 Let me not be disappointed, for in thee do I trust.  
 The wicked are consumed out of the land, 21  
 And the Misrites Yahwè has cut off.  
 He sets free<sup>3</sup> \* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> Jerahmeel and.      <sup>2</sup> According to thy lovingkindness.

<sup>3</sup> (Set free) Israel, O God ! from all his distresses.

4. **Deride me.** So xxii. 8, lxxx. 7; cp. xlv. 14, lxxix. 4, cxxiii. 4.—6. *The traitors*, cp. on ix. 6.—*Turn back*, i.e. let their attack be fruitless (cp. vi. 10b, &c.).—7 f. The *ways* and *paths* of Yahwè are his course of action towards Israel and Israel's enemies. How deeply the mysterious *ways* of God preoccupy all thoughtful Jews is manifest from Pss. xlix., lxxiii., xcii., xciv., &c.—9. *For their wickedness.* Again and again (ll. 13 ff., 22, 41 f.) the psalmist emphasizes the fact that the Jahmeelite oppression was contrary to the fundamental laws of morality (cp. Pss. x., xciv.).—10. **אלהי ישעי** (so Isa. xvii. 10) possesses a new force in the revised text.—13–15. Notice the beautiful parallelism of the couplets in the restored text. **יִשָּׁר** might conceivably mean 'gracious,' but most probably there is a contrast between the 'goodness' and 'uprightness' of Yahwè and the evil, unrighteous, insincere character of the Jerahmeelites.

17–28. **In the right course=**

in 'the way that He (Yahwè) chooses' (l. 24). It is this that the עֲנִיִּים (i.e. pious Israel) find so hard to believe; they require much 'teaching'; 'the secret' (l. 27) is only revealed to those who practise the 'fear' and 'love' of Yahwè's name (cp. on v. 11). The 'wilderness' may be the right way to Canaan, suffering and oppression the prelude to the enjoyment of an empire. *He himself . . . his offspring*, an inconsistency (see introd.), for, of course, the poet means Israel. Cp. Ps. xxxiv. (introd.). To 'abide (לָחַץ) in prosperity' and to 'inherit the land' are synonymous. *The secret* (סֵדֶר), or 'the intimacy'; cp. Prov. iii. 32 f., and Frankenberg *ad loc.*

30. **The net**, fitly referred to in connexion with the בְּנֵרִים, 'traitors' (l. 6); cp. ix. 16 (note).

41. **Consumed out of the land.** The 'holy' land was 'defiled' by the presence of heathen (cp. xxxvii. 9, 38, and especially civ. 35).

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. Sievers, in his metrical arrangement, finds l. 1 both short and unmetrical; following G (B A A) he takes in אלהי from v. 2. Bickell and Duhm admit the shortness, but omit אלהי as a superfluous addition, and, as l. 2, supply from v. 5c פִּלְהִיּוֹם. Matthes (in Kue., *Ond.*<sup>(2)</sup>, iii. 205) takes a hint from lxxxvi. 3b, 4b, and reads אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה אֱקָרָא | נַפְשִׁי אִשָּׁא אֶל-אֱלֹהֵי אֱקָרָא. The insertion of אֱקָרָא in l. 1 is good; but it has not been observed that נַפְשִׁי אִשָּׁא is deeply corrupt. Besides, we require, if it may be, a touch of historical colouring, and much more passion; and, from the experience we have already gained in Pss. i.-xxiv., we can obtain this. Read אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה | שְׁמִרְנִי מִיִּשְׁמְעָאִלִּים אֱקָרָא. The ר in שְׁמִרְנִי fell out, and what remained became נַפְשִׁי (the same case again in xlii. 7a). אִשָּׁא together with אֱלֹהֵי (cp. G) represents יִשְׁמְעָאִלִּים.

4. M **עֲלִצְנִי**. But עֲלִץ, like Ass. *eleṣu*, always means 'to exult,' never 'to mock'; this too would require בִּי. Read יִלְעֲנִי (Gr.); לִי follows quite regularly (ii. 4). G καταγελασάτωσάν μου.

5. M **בְּלִי קִיּוֹד לֹא**. Sievers suggests the omission of כל. On metrical grounds, however, as Sievers himself holds, this step is unnecessary. Apparently he feels the expression to be an awkward one; כל adds nothing to the sense. Besides, נָם ought to introduce a climax. Quite possibly כל ק' may come from חֲלִמִיר, i.e. יִרְחַמְאֵלִי. This suits all the conditions of the case, and should be right.

6, 8. The second **יָשָׁבוּ** should be **יֵשְׁבוּ** (cp. vi. 11). The very awkward **רִיקָם** of course = **יִרְחַמְאֵל** (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Rekem'). The art. and the **ם** in **הַבְּנִידִים** are editorial.—Read **וְאִרְחוּתִךָ** (G & Sievers), for metre.

9. M **הִדְרִיכֵנִי בְּאַמְתָּךְ** | **וְלִמְדֵנִי**. Ewald and Duhm omit **לִמְדֵנִי** as a repetition from *v.* 4*b*; but metre opposes this. That something is wrong is suggested by Pasek, but without the key we could not say what. A glance at **וְלִמְדֵנִי** shows that it comes from **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**, and this is confirmed by our finding at the end of *v.* 6 one of the ordinary corruptions of **יִרְחַמְאֵל**, viz. **כָּל־הַיּוֹם** (cp. on xlv. 23, lvi. 2, lxxiv. 22). The truth is that **כָּל־הַיּוֹם** (cp. *v.* 5*b*), which has so embarrassed us all, and which Wellh. and Sievers have treated as an imperfect 1 couplet (G, in fact, prefixes *καί*), is really a doublet to **וְלִמְדֵנִי** **הִדְ**. But what is it that underlies these two corrupt readings? Evidently a prayer against Jerahmeel; and since it is the **ה** couplet, we cannot be wrong in correcting **הִדְ** and **קוֹיִתִּי** into **הַכְּרִית**, and **בְּרַעְתָּם** and **אוֹתְךָ** into **בְּרַעְתָּם** (see on liv. 7).

12. M **וְחִסְדֶּיךָ כִּי מַעֲלָם הָמָה** (placing **וְח** in *v.* 6*a*). The sentence is 'very badly constructed,' says Sievers, but slight remedies such as he suggests are useless. Read **וְחִסְדֶּיךָ יִרְחַמְאֵלִים** (xix. 14). **כִּי** and **יך** both = **יח**, which, with **מַעֲלָם** (**מַאֲלִים**), represents **יח**. **הָמָה** (= **חָמָה**) also comes from **יח**.

13. Note the warning Pasek. The editor has desiderated a contrite appeal for the forgiveness of Israel's sins. But the psalmist is conscious of Israel's rectitude, **יִרְחַמְאֵל וּשְׁמַעְאֵל נַעֲוִירִי וּפְשָׁעִי לֹא** is a recast of **יִרְחַמְאֵל וּשְׁמַעְאֵל**; metre, however, requires the excision of **יח**. **זָכַרְלִי אַתָּה** is metrically superfluous, and seems to be a recast of **אֶל־תִּזְכֹּר**; **כַּחֲסָד** is doubtless editorial.

16. M **עַל־כֵּן יוֹרָה הַטָּאִים בְּדָרְךָ**. Obviously 'sinners' must be wrong. In ed. 1, following Bickell, I read **חַטָּאִים**, 'those that miss their aim' (so lately We., Du.). But this is difficult, and the context suggests a reference to Jerahmeel. **בְּדָרְךָ** belongs to a familiar type of error, and may (cp. **בְּכִרְכּוֹרֹת**, Isa. lxvi. 21) represent **יח**; so also may **חַטָּאִים**, through editorial manipulation. **יִירֵד** = **יִירָה**.—18*f*. For **עֲנִיִּים** read **אֲבִיּוֹנִים** (Gr.), and, for metre, read **כָּל־אִרְחוּתִּי** (Sievers).

22. As in *l.* 13, the expression of penitence is due to the editor. Read **אֶל־תִּזְכֹּר** (cp. cix. 14). Fragments of **אֶל־תִּזְכֹּר** became

28. M **וּבְרִיתִי לְהוֹדִיעַם**, 'intolerable' (Siévers); also inexplicable.

See Duhm's resource of despair. Surely סוד and ברית and וברכתו לאהבי שמו (L. 28) ought to be parallel. Read

32. M יהיד, 'an only one'? 'Desolate,' 'friendless' is an imaginary sense. Read חסיד (Gr.); cp. lxxxvi. 2.

33 f. M. הרחיבו, 'admittedly gives no sense' (Bä.). Neither הרחיבו ('have terrified,' Bä.), nor הרחיב (Merrick, Hupf., Kau., We., Sievers, &c.), nor הרחק ו (Du.) is an adequate remedy. Both לבבי and הרחיב surely must be fragments of ירחמאלים. Read צרונִי ירח (cxxxix. 1 f.), reserving the traditional ו in הרחיבו for the next line (ומִמֶּנּוּ)

35 f. Vv. 18 and 19 ought to give the ק and the ר distichs, instead of which we have two ר distichs. Independently, Duhm and the present writer have sought to remedy this. Duhm (improving upon a conjecture of Ew.) supposes that v. 19 began with קדם, but was forgotten by the scribe, who afterwards wrote it in the margin, from which it was re-inserted in the text, in an altered form, after instead of before v. 18 (for קדם איבִי, cf. xvii. 13, xviii. 19). But 'confront mine enemies' does not fit in well; on the other hand, ראה is quite natural (cf. iii. 2). The ק distich must have become partly illegible, and have been restored by conjecture. The result is a very poor, weak sense. Read, rather, comparing cxxx. 2,

מִשְׁבוֹת אֲנִיד לְדַמְעָתִי  
וְשִׁמְעֵ לְקוֹל אֲנַחְתִּי

37 f. In L. 38, וְשִׁנְאַת חָמֶם שְׁנֹאוֹנִי, 'a hatred of (leading to) injustice,' is very strange. As we go on, we shall find more and more how fond the psalmists are of accumulating the ethnic names of their foes. One of these, 'Ishmael,' is frequently corrupted into some word with נ instead of ל; another, 'Cushim,' as frequently assumes the disguise of חָמֶם (see e.g. Ps. xviii. 49). This suggests how to emend the rather poor words of L. 37. The whole couplet becomes ('Ishmael' being twice represented), וְשִׁמְעֵ אֱלֹהִים וְכָשִׁים | רֹאֵה יִרְחַמְאֵלִים.

41 f. L. 42 is metrically incomplete; Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Du. supply יהוה from G. But this is not enough. The whole couplet is improbable. Whose 'perfectness' and 'uprightness' are meant? Yahwè's or Israel's? Either view can be defended. Just as the Zoroastrians had an Amesha-spenta called Obedience, so Israel might personify its loyalty and righteousness as angels (cp. xliii. 3, lxi. 8). Yahwè, too, is called יֵשֶׁר (Dt. xxxii. 4), and might be called תְּמִים (cp. xviii. 26). But all this is highly improbable. We must take the ת couplet here with that in xxxiv. 22, and read וְיִצְרֵם הַבְּרִית יְהוָה | וְיִצְרֵם הַבְּרִית יְהוָה.



Note that **יֵשֹׁר** represents both **רשעים** and **כֹּאֲרֵץ**, and that **נִי** in **יֵצֹ**, as often, = **מִ**.

43 f. Point perhaps **פִּדְדָה**. What follows ought to connect as well with the preceding passage as the corresponding couplet in Ps. xxxiv.\* See introd.

## PSALM XXVI.

**T**RIMETERS. Innocence and especially love to Yahwè's house claim their assured recompense. The character described here is that of the pious community of Israel to which the psalmist belongs. Cp. Ps. i., but observe that in Ps. xxvi. the chamber of the scribe has not yet come into competition with the temple. The community is conscious of its separateness from the opposition-conclave of the lawless (see on v. 9; there is, however, some danger in resorting to the temple, and so gratifying the deepest longings of true believers. To suppose, with Ewald, that a prevalent sickness was the occasion of the psalm, would be a great mistake. Ver. 9 rightly understood points forward to the great Messianic judgment. Cp. Pss. xxv., xxvii., and partly ci. G prefixes **πρὸ τοῦ χρισθῆναι** (**Δαυεῖδ**), probably an interpretation of **לַמְשׁוּחַ**, a corrupt form of **לְזֹבְחִים**.

*Of 'Arab-ethan.*

I

- |    |   |      |
|----|---|------|
| 1  | Right me, O Yahwè, for I walk in integrity,<br>In thy paths I waver not.  |      |
|    | Prove me, O Yahwè, and try me,<br>Test my reins and my heart.   | 2    |
|    | For thy goodness is my pattern,<br>In thy truth do I walk.  | 3    |
|    | I do not sit +in conclave+ with men of falsehood,<br>I do not commune with the impious. <sup>1</sup>  | 4    |
|    | I have a desire for the dwelling-place of thy glory,  | 6, 8 |
| 10 | For thine altar, O Yahwè, do I long,<br>That I may publish with the voice of thanksgiving,<br>And tell out all thy wondrous works.                            | 7    |
|    | Snatch not away my soul with sinners,<br>Or my life with the shedders of blood,<br>Whose mouth talks of crimes,<br>And their right hand is full of treachery. | 9    |
|    | As for me, I walk +still+ in integrity ;<br>Set me free, [O Yahwè,] have pity upon me.  | 10   |
|    | My foot stands on level ground,   | 11   |
| 20 | I bless Yahwè in his temple.  |      |

<sup>1</sup> I hate the assembly of evil-doers,  
And do not sit +in conclave+ with the wicked (v. 5).

2. Contrast lxxiii. 2.—3, 4. Cp. xvii. 3.—5. לִנְגַד עֵינַי. Cp. ci. 3. חֶסֶד אֱלֹהִים (2 S. ix. 3), *i.e.* such goodness as God shows to his people is the standard of my acts (cp. Hos. vi. 6; Jer. xxii. 16).—6. *In thy truth*, *i.e.* in the only true, trustworthy course of action—that which Yahwè prescribes (lxxxvi. 11, cp. v. 9), the path of his commandments (cxix. 35), which are truth (xix. 96). Cp. Eccus. xli. 19.

7 f. **Men of falsehood.** Cp. l. 16; xxiv. 4; cxliv. 8.—*With the impious.* See on xiv. 1 (נָבִל), and below, on ll. 13–16. שָׁוֵא is parallel to נָבִל here, as אָוֶן in Isa. xxxii. 6.

9. Cp. xxvii. 4. The temple may be equally well called the ‘dwelling-place’ of Yahwè (lxxxiv. 1) and of his glory (cp. 1 K. viii. 10 f.). It will be noticed that the difficult phrase about ‘washing the hands in innocence’ disappears from the corrected text. We are thus not compelled to imagine an allusion to the rite prescribed in Ex. xxx. 17–21 (P). The reference in M to processions round the altar (cp. on cxviii. 27) also disappears. It is enough that the speaker loves those sacrifices best in which the most important element is thanksgiving (cp. xxvii. 6). See crit. n.

13–16. The true Israel deprecates being merged in the same body with the ‘sinners,’ or false Israelites, in its midst. Both classes may frequent the

temple, but outside the sacred precincts they form different societies (lines 7, 8; i. 1, 5). To join the company or conclave of the ‘impious’ would render a man liable to the same fate with them. Cp. on l. 18. According to M the unjust rich are the persons specially referred to; their ‘right hand’ is said to be full, not of ‘treachery’ (as in our text), but of ‘bribes,’ *i.e.* presumably those which they receive as judges; cp. Mic. vii. 3. But the description is not free from difficulty. V. 10a and b are not parallel, and in spite of cxxxix. 19, 24 (reading בָּצַע) it is not natural to describe ‘a shedder of blood’ by saying that his hands are full of ‘bribes.’ The idiom in v. 10a has also much strangeness. For the text here adopted, cp. cxliv. 7, 11.

17. אֵלֶּךְ, ‘I go on walking,’ in spite of all temptations and hindrances. —פִּדְנִי, cp. xxv. 22, where ‘set Israel free’ justifies the assumption that in Ps. xxvii., as well as in Ps. xxv., the true Israel is the speaker.

19. The ideas of breadth and levelness are connected; he who broadens a path will not have omitted to level it (cp. iv. 2, v. 9). Note the perfect עֲמַדָּה. Instead of saying, ‘When my course meets with no hindrance, I will bless Yahwè,’ believing Israel imaginatively realizes the future as if it were the present. *On level ground . . . in his temple*; fresh points of contact with Ps. xxvii. (zv. 11, 6).

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. Omit אָנִי, inserted from l. 17. There אָנִי is helpful and appropriate; here it is not wanted, and spoils the metre.—M וּבִיהוּה בַּשְּׁחָתִי. This does not cohere at all with לֹא אֲמַעַד, nor does it suit the address to Yahwè in l. 1. יְהוּה is not unfrequently misread, and really represents a fragment of some other word. Read here Cp. xvii. 5.

8. M נִגְלָמִים. As Gr. and Herz. have seen, ‘the hidden’ (or ‘self-hiders’?) cannot be a unique class-name = ‘deceivers.’ Gr. proposes נִגְלָמִים (cp. Jer. xv. 17); Herz, מְלַעֲיָנִים. G guesses as if הוֹלֵלִים. The right reading should be clear. ׀ נְבִלִים = נְלִמִים. For an exact parallel see on lviii. 2a.

9 f. Verses 6 and 8 in M and G are extremely singular. ‘To wash

the hands in innocence' is an unexampled expression for 'to keep the hands innocent'; nor can we say that 'to encircle the altar of Yahwè' is a suitable phrase for the parallel line. The cohortative **אֲסַבְּבָה** is unexpected (see, however, Kön., *Synt.*, p. 92, § 198a); and the compound phrases in *v.* 8a and *b* (especially that in *b*) are also, though grammatically possible, hardly probable. Add to this that, if the psalm is composed of four-line stanzas, the two stichi of *v.* 8 seem to be superfluous. A comparison of *v.* 6 and *v.* 8 shows that *v.* 8 (apart from **יְהוָה אֲהַבְתִּי**) consists of corrupt dittographic corrections of **כִּפִּי בְנִקְיוֹן** in *v.* 6, and, **אֲסַבְּבָה** being suspicious, it becomes probable that **יְהוָה אֲהַבְתָּא** represents a marginal correction of the insufficient **יְהוָה** at the end of *v.* 6. A comparison of the || passages xxvii. 4, lxxxiv. 3 suggests further that 'longing,' not 'loving,' is the idea which must have been expressed by the verbs of *v.* 6; in short, that **אֲרַחֵץ** should be **אֶחְפֹּץ**, and that **אֲהַבְתִּי** should be **תִּתְאַבְּקֵי**. It is now plain that the corrupt variants in *v.* 8 both represent **מִשְׁכְּנוֹ בְּבוֹדָךְ**, *i.e.* **מִשְׁכְּנוֹ** (rightly written once) assumed three corrupt forms, viz. **מִעוֹן**, **מְקוֹם**, and **נִקְיוֹן**. Cp. on lxxiii. 13*b*.

15 f. M **אֲשֶׁר-בִּידֵיהֶם זִמָּה**. By rights this should make only a dimeter. But the chief difficulty is exegetical. Can this phrase mean 'whose hands show the marks of crimes'? Other objections are mentioned above. Comparing cxliv. 7, 11, read **אֲשֶׁר-פִּיהֶם יִדְּבַר זִמָּה**; **דָּב** is still represented in **בִּידֵיהֶם**. In *v.* 16 **שִׁחַר** should be **שִׁקָּר**, completing the || to cxliv. 7.

18. Metre bids us insert **יְהוָה**, which (written as 'י') easily fell out after **פָּדֵנִי**.

20. M **בְּמִקְהָלִים**. The plur. is suspicious; besides, **מִקְהָלוֹת** in lxviii. 27 and (place-name) Num. xxiii. 25 is corrupt. Read here **בְּמִוְהִיכְלוֹ**. Cp. xxvii. 6.

## PSALM XXVII.

**PENTAMETERS.** Two psalms are combined, the one full of calm but deep joy in God and affection for the temple, the other (which is incomplete) a psalm of anxious supplication. In both, Israel is the speaker; the individualizing explanation of *v.* 10 (Coblentz, 169) is not at all necessary (see Bā.) even if M's text be accepted, and is not favoured by the rest of the psalm, which is full of points of contact with psalms of the community. xxvii.<sup>(1)</sup> is specially parallel to iii., iv., xxiii., xxvi., lxi., lxiii.; and xxviii.<sup>(2)</sup> to v., vi., xxxi., xxxv., xxxviii. For the references to Israel's foes, cp. Ps. lxxxiii. *V.* 13 is a liturgical appendix, like xiv. 7.

XXVII.—1.

*Of 'Arab-ethan.*

1 Yahwè is my light and my succour; | whom have I to fear?

Yahwè is my life's fortress; | at whom have I to tremble?

When Jerahmeelites press about me | with Geshurites and  
Mišrites,

2

When Arabians lie in ambush to kill me, | they +will+  
stumble and fall.

\* If Ammon encamp against me, | my heart will not fear ; 3  
If Jerahmeel assail me, | I will keep trusting in him.

One thing of Yahwè I crave, | that is my request<sup>1</sup>— 4

That I may give thanks in Yahwè's abode, | and bless in

• his temple.

For he hides me in his sanctuary—in the day of trouble ; 5

10 Hè covers me in the shelter of his palace, | from those of

Miṣṣur he guards me.

He exalts my head above the Arabians | in the covert of  
his house ;

6

Now therefore will I offer in his palace | sacrifices of  
thanksgiving.<sup>2</sup>

1. **My light.** Here only ; but  
cp. 'thy light,' Isa. lx. 1, and for the  
figure, iv. 7, xxxvi. 10. On כָּעֵיז, see  
Ges.-Buhl, s.v., and cp. on xc. 1.

3. **Press about me.** Or, 'assail  
me.' No doubt קָרַב עַל implies a  
hostile intent, but not necessarily  
'attacking' ; cp. cxix. 150 (קָרַבוּ)  
with cv. 95 ('waited for me'), 110  
(*'laid a snare for me'*). The object  
in the present case is stated to be 'to  
behold my disgrace' ; for so we should  
most probably read, not 'to eat up my  
flesh,' an unnatural figurative expres-  
sion, and in l. 4 we hear of 'ambush'  
(a *certain* correction). Cp. lix. 4,  
where the 'men of blood' (v. 3) are  
represented as preferring ambush to  
open warfare.

4. **Lie in ambush.** Cp. Jer.  
iii. 2, where, however, the play on  
words (אָרַב, עָרַב) is wanting.—  
*They +will+ stumble and fall.* The  
perfects are best taken, not as recording  
past experience (Hu., Ol., Kön.), but  
as 'perfects of confidence.' See xx. 9  
(הַמָּה כָּרְעוּ).

5. Cp. iii. 7.—8. See xxvi. 12,  
and cp. c. 4, 'Give thanks unto him,  
bless his name.' To praise God is  
pious Israel's chief pleasure and duty,  
lxxxiv. 5, xcii. 1, cxlvii. 1, cv. 1-3, &c.  
The correction adopted surely gives a  
fresh spiritual beauty to the psalm.—  
11. *He covers me*, &c. Cp. xxxi. 21,  
lxi. 5.—13. *Sacrifices of thanksgiving*,  
as cvii. 22. Hu. takes the phrase  
symbolically (l. 14), but this is hardly  
natural.

**Critical Notes.** 3. Let us first consider M's  
as a mark of the accus. is exceedingly rare in the first half of the Psalter.  
If we add to this the fact that "to eat my flesh" is far too harsh in this  
context, I should be inclined to read לִכְלֹת בֶּשֶׁת, the two א having crept in  
through association of ideas' (Herz). Gr. retains M, but makes 'to eat up  
my flesh' = 'to slander me' (cp. v. 12), an Aramaizing and Arabizing sense

<sup>1</sup> To dwell in Yahwè's house all the days of my life.

<sup>2</sup> I will sing and chant hymns to Yahwè.

(see Ges.-Bu.), which we can hardly assume in Biblical Hebrew. The passage can, however, be corrected much more safely in the light of Ps. lxxxiii. and 2 K. xxiv. 2 (Cushites, Edomites, Miṣrites, Amalekites, or Jerahmeelites). **עלי מרעים**, as in xcii. 12, represents **ירחמאלים** (two beats); note Pasek. So also does **לאכל את־בשרי**. **ירחמאלים** comes from **מַצְרִים**, and **צרי** from **מַצְרִים**. Read, therefore,

**בְּקֶרֶב יִרְחַמְאֵלִים | וַיִּשְׁמַעְאֵלִים וּמַצְרִים**

4. **ואיבי** clearly represents first of all **עֶרְבִי**, but probably also **בְּאֶרֶב**, which is required to make sense (prefix to **ערבי**). For **המה לי** read perhaps **לְהַמְתִּי**.

5. **מחנה**. But just before we have **תחנה**; note also Pasek. **מחנה** is not beautiful, and how can **מחנה** be fem.? In Gen. xxxi. 9 **האחת** is an error (see Ball *ad loc.*). Read probably **עֲמֹן** (lxxxiii. 8).

6. **מלחמה** is clearly wrong. Read **יִרְחַמְאֵל**. So the last historical touch is added. M's **בואת** (so too G) is unnatural; it is miswritten **בוטח**. The closing word **בוטח** is a misplaced correction of **בואת**. It has expelled **בו**, which, however, is indispensable after **בוטח**.

7. The words omitted as a gloss (at the suggestion of Duhm) are nearly a verbal quotation from xxiii. 6. They overload the material to be brought into stanzas. See on l. 8.

8. M **לְחֹזֶת בְּנַעֲמֵי**. The sense of **נַעַם** (G *τερπνότης*; Σ *κύλλος*) is disputed. Ges., *Theol.*, says, 'de sacrorum splendore' (so de Wette, Bü.); Hu., 'it is the kindness of a host towards his dependents or guests'; Del., 'the gracious self-revelation of Yahwè.' To each of these views there are obvious objections. The first mentioned, however, has at least the merit of accordance with the reference to the temple in l. 8b. But the phrase is very odd Hebrew, and both here and in xc. 17 there seems to be corruption. As a remedy here Herz proposes **לְחֹסֶת**. **בְּמַעֲוֵי**. Clearly **מַעֲוֵן** is right; in xxvi. 8 the mistake here made by M is made by G, which has *ἐνπρέπειαν* (M **מַעֲוֵן**). But **חסה** is specially appropriated to trust in God, and unsuitable here. We want something which shall be parallel to the word underlying **בקר**. Surely **לבקר** cannot mean 'to visit in the morning' (cp. v. 4), as We. supposes; as in 2 K. xvi. 15, there must be corruption. G's *ἐπισκεπτεσθαι* (**לְבַקֵּר**?) does not help us; it is a conjecture suggested by the wrong reading **לחזות** (*τοῦ θεωρεῖν*) just before. Is there no pair of verbs descriptive of the religious occupation which Israel most earnestly desires, *i.e.* as the gloss (see on l. 7) suggests, dwelling for ever in Yahwè's house? Surely there is; and if we read lxxxiv. 5, it will be plain that the words indirectly suggested by the gloss are **לְהֹדֹת** and **לְבָרֵךְ** (see *exeg. note*). In the

former **הו** easily became **חז**, and, by transposition and exchange of **כ** for **ק**, **ברך** (the latter word) as easily became

9. **בְּסֶכְוִי** Kr. (so most vss.); better Kt. **בְּסֶכְהָ** S (so Ol., Now., Bā., We.), cp. xxvi. 21, Isa. iv. 6. But the true reading is **בְּמִקְדָּשָׁיו** (cp. on lxxvi. 3).—10. **בְּסִתָּר** is tautological after **יִסְתַּרְנִי**. Read probably **בְּסִפְתָּ**; after **כ** had fallen out **ר** was naturally added. For **אֵהְלוּ** read **הֵיכְלוּ** (see on xv. 1).—M **בְּצֹר יְרוּמִנִי**. Read **יִשְׁמְרֵנִי** (cp. on xviii. 49).

11. **וְעֵתָה** (v. 6), which in some MSS. is followed by **פֶּסֶק**, should open l. 2. **יְרוֹם** should probably be **יָרִים**.—Read **עֲרִבִים** (l. 4).—makes a very poor half-line. G *ἐκύκλωσα* (*καὶ ἔθυσσα*), i.e. **בְּסִתָּר בֵּיתִי**; which Bā. adopts; cp. xxvi. 6. Rather perhaps such coalescing is nothing uncommon.

12. Read **בְּהִיכְלוֹ** (see on l. 10).—M **זִבְחֵי תְרוּעָה** (cp. Num. x. 10?), a most improbable phrase. G *θυσίαν ἀλαλαγμοῦ*, but also *θ. αἰνέσεως*, or *θ. αἰν. κ. ἀλ.* (see Swete). Cp. Job viii. 21, where M has **תְרוּעָה**, but G *ἐξομολογήσεως* = **תוֹדָה**. In Ps. cvii. 22, cxvi. 7 *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως* = M's **זִבְחֵי תְרוּעָה**. **תְרוּעָה** comes from **תוֹדָה**, miswritten for **תוֹדָה**. So Herz.—The closing words of v. 6 are evidently a later addition (Du.); they spoil the stanza.

## XXVII.—2.

1 Unto thee, O Yahwè ! do I cry ; | have pity upon me, and  
answer me ; 7  
For my heart and my flesh languish, | my soul I pour out  
+in tears . 8

[I say] do not thou hide | thy face from me ; 9  
Be not angered at thy servant, | be thou my help.

Cast me not off, nor forsake me, | O God +who art+ my  
succour ! 10

For mine acquaintance have forsaken me, | and who will  
take me in ?

Show me thy way, O Yahwè ! | [redeem me, and have  
pity upon me ;] 11

Lead me on an even path | because of Ishmael.

[In thy lovingkindness] abandon me not | to the greed of  
my foes, 12

10 For the Ishmaelites vent their rage upon me, | and those  
of Jerahmeel.

*Liturgical Appendix.*

May Yahwè grant me to see | the courts of his house. 13

<sup>1</sup> Be strong, let thy heart be firm ; | yea, wait for Yahwè.\*

2. Parallel to vi. 3, 4, 7<sup>b</sup>. See also xxii. 15, 'I am poured out like water,' with special reference to the heart, as here to the soul. In xlii. 5 the text is doubtful. In Lam. ii. 19, pouring out the heart 'like water' before Yahwè, *i.e.* expressing the inward sorrow, by which the central forces of a man are as it were dissolved, is represented as a means of acting upon the divine will. —4. *Thy servant*, *i.e.* Israel, as xix. 12.

6. As in parallel descriptions, it is one of the most bitterly felt sorrows of the suffering but righteous community to be forsaken by the whole body of its friends. כִּידַעִי; cp. lv. 14, lxxxviii. 9, 19, where Israel is the speaker, and Job xix. 14. M's text, as generally understood, is beautiful, but is not strictly in place here (see crit. n.).—*Who will take me in*, *i.e.* as a guest or 'client,' with the claim to protection

which, among Semitic nations, appertains to a guest.

7 f. Cp. lxxxvi. 11, xxvi. 12, cxliii. 10, and see on v. 9.—9. בִּנְפֶשׁ צָרִי; cp. xli. 3, Ezek. xvi. 27.

10. Geshur, Ishmaelites, &c., representatives of the malicious neighbouring populations. Cp. xxxv. 11, 12, liv. 4, 7, lxxiv. 3, and other passages.

13 f. Line 13 is a little prayer (to be sung by one part of the chorus?) which adapts the preceding composite psalm to general use (cp. xiv. 8). Pious Israel's one great wish is to enjoy unhindered participation in the temple services. To this is added an address (to be sung by the other part of the chorus?) to pious Israel, bidding it maintain the 'patience of hope' in Yahwè. Cp. xxxi. 25.

*Critical Notes.* 1. מ קוֹלִי אֶקְרָא. The words are united by the accents, but the supposition of a second subject is unnatural (cp. on iii. 5). G's τῆς φωνῆς μου ἧς ἐκέκραξα is not much better. Read אֵלֶיךָ אֶקְרָא (see on iii. 5).

2. M is here very strange. T throws no light upon it. J gives, *Tibi dixit cor meum, quæsiuit vultus meus*. Ol., Bā., We., follow M, and render, 'Thine, saith my heart, is (the word), "Seek ye my face,"' which resembles a very doubtful view of xxii. 2 (end), held by Ol. and Bā. How is M to be corrected? We might plausibly suppose בָּקֵשׁ פָּנַי to be a corruption of פָּנֶיךָ [את] אֶבְקֶשׁ. There might have been two readings put side by side, which only differed in the order of the words. G in fact has ἐξέζητησα τὸ πρόσωπόν σου · τὸ πρόσωπόν σου Κύριε ζητήσω. But for ἐξέζητησα there are the *vur.* ll. -ησεν and ζητήσω; cp. Σ σὲ ἐζήτην τὸ πρὸς. μου. (Cp. further Bā., *Jahrbb. f. pr. Th.*, '82, 618). But in G's time the text of the Psalms was already so corrupt that we must look behind both G and M; in fact, if we did adopt one of the two supposed readings, we should still have to explain לֶךְ אֶמְרָ לְבִי, which, however, will not yield a satisfactory sense. The first thing that strikes us is the poor connexion between 'Thy face, Yahwè, do I seek,' and 'Hide not thy face from me.' It is not likely that פָּנֶיךָ occurred in two successive

<sup>1</sup> Wait for Yahwè.

lines, nor indeed that after the earnest appeal in *l.* 1, the psalmist thought it necessary to state that he 'sought Yahwè's face' at all. Let us remember the habits of the scribe, and look underneath **אִבְקֶשׁ**. If the word is wrong, the word out of which it has been produced is **אֶשְׁפֹּךְ**. And since **פָּנִי** and **פָּנִיךְ** are no doubt competing readings, let us read **פָּנִי**, and correct it to **נַפְשִׁי**, which goes naturally with **אֶשְׁפֹּךְ**, and corresponds to **לְבִי** in *l.* 2*a*. (The **ש** fell out owing to the nearness of another **ש**.) **בִּקְשׁוֹ** must also be wrong. It stands after **לְבִי**; can we be wrong in correcting **וּבִשְׂרִי**; and so completing the triad 'heart,' 'flesh,' 'soul' (cp. xvi. 9*f*.)? The whole pentameter should run,

initial **ל** in **מִלֶּךְ**, and the **ר** in **אִמְרֶךָ**, have come  
from the second syll. of **אִמְלֵל**. See exeg. note.

3. To complete the half-line prefix **אִמְרֶךָ** (xci. 2, cii. 25), which perhaps fell out owing to the nearness of another **אִמְרֶךָ** in *M* (*γ*. 8).

4. Read **אֶל־תִּתְּאֲנֶפֶּה בְּעַבְדְּךָ** (Dt. i. 37), and **הִיָּה עֲזָרְתִּי** (G; Du.); **ה** and **ת** confounded.

6. **מִי־אָבִי וְאִמִּי עֲזֹבֹנִי**. The sense of this often quoted passage is not clear. Is the clause hypothetical (Hu., Ew.) or historical? And are 'father' and 'mother' symbols of the nearest friends of the community of Yahwè-worshippers? Or are Isa. lxiii. 16 (cp. xliii. 27?), Jer. xxxi. 16 parallel passages, so that Jacob and Leah or Rachel respectively would be the parents intended, and the (rhetorical) complaint would be that the cults by which the people at large thought to compensate for the ineffectualness of the authorized cult of Yahwè had proved vain helps? And how could Yahwè be said to become Israel's protector at this advanced period of history? The very phrase, 'Cast me not off, nor forsake me' (*l.* 5), implies that Yahwè had given proofs enough of his protecting care for Israel. We must therefore also consider *l.* 6*b*, **וַיְהוּדָה יִסְפְּנִי**. Gr.'s **Ἰσραὴλ** (G, *προσελάβετό με*) is no improvement. If the speaker is sure that Yahwè either 'has taken him in,' or 'will take him in,' how comes he to fall again into the tone of anxious supplication? We should expect the happy declaration, 'Yahwè taketh me in,' to have been expanded (cp. Isa. xlix. 15), and to have been followed by jubilant praise. There is some error in the text, and many parallels suggest an adequate correction. Read **בְּיָמֵי עֲזֹבֹנִי וּמִי הוּא יִסְפְּנִי**. If **מִי־אָבִי** were written **דְּעִי וְדְעִי** and **מִי** might easily become **אָבִי** and **אִמִּי** respectively, and since **נִי** and **מִי** are constantly confounded, the **מִי** in **וּמִי** would easily drop out as a repetition. And then it would be almost inevitable that **וַיְהוּדָה** should become

7 *f*. To complete the line, insert **פָּדֵנִי וְחַנְנִי** (xxvi. 11*b*). **חַנְנִי** would very easily fall out before **נַחֲנִי**.—Read **יִשְׁמַעֲלָל** (see on v. 9, lix. 11).



9. Prefix **בחסדך**, the three last letters of which resemble **שרר** in the preceding word, and would therefore easily fall out.

10. M **יִקְמוּנִי**. Read **עֲדִי-שִׁקֵּר**.—M **יִקְמוּנִי**. Slander was no doubt one of the chief forms of the hostilities from which the Jews of Palestine suffered, according to the Psalter. But observe 1. that 'slander' and 'false witness' are not the same thing, and 2. that we cannot take this passage apart from xxxv. 11, where the appearance of a forensic reference is due to textual corruption. Read most probably **יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים**. M **וַיִּפַּח חֲמָם**. **יִפַּח** is a very doubtful *ἀπ. λεγ.*; see on xii. 6. Read probably **וַיִּרְחַמְּאֵלִים**.

11 f. M **לֹלֵא הָאֲמֵנִי**. The 'extraordinary points,' *both above and below*, bid us cancel **לֹלֵא** (Ginsb., *Introd.*, 333; cp. Baer's note, and Berlin in *JQR* xii. 732). G does not go so far as this, but it only recognizes **לֵה**, which it misreads **לֵה** (*καὶ ἐψεύσατο ἡ ἀδικία ἐαυτῇ*, *v.* 12). R. Josè (*Berachoth*, 4a) only cancelled **לֹ**, *i.e.* read **לֵא הָאֲמֵ**; so Abbott (*Essays*, 24). Gr. takes **לֹ** to be a corruption of **לִי**, which he attaches to *v.* 12); he too makes **לֵא** a prefix to **הָאֲמֵ**. None of these expedients produces a satisfactory sense. Whether we read 'I am confident' or 'I despair' (of seeing Yahwè's goodness), the clause does not fit on suitably to the preceding petitions. 'I am confident' says too much, unless indeed it were followed by 'for Yahwè has heard my supplication' (*vi.* 9), and even then some abruptness would be noticeable. Besides this, the prescribed cancelling of **לֹלֵא** has to be accounted for. In lxxvii. 2 **לֵילֵה** comes from **אֱלֹהִים**; most probably **לֹלֵא** has the same origin; most probably, too, the initial **הָאֲמֵ** in **הָאֲמֵנִי** springs from the **הִם** in **אֱלֹהִים** (which was written as a correction of **לֹלֵא**). And now the secret of **הָאֲמֵנִי** reveals itself. **הָאֲמֵ** has been just accounted for: **נָתִי** must surely come from **יָתֵנִי**, a mutilated form of **יְהוָה**.—M **לְרִאֻת בְּטוֹב יְהוָה**. This cannot be right if **אֱלֹהִים** precedes. Another difficulty is caused by **בְּאֶרֶץ חַיִּים**, with which M G close the passage, and which is metrically superfluous, unless indeed, with Duhm, we prefix something to it by conjecture to form the last line of the psalm. **אֶרֶץ**, however, in M's text, is not unfrequently corrupted from something else, and the analogy of xiv. 7 leads us to suspect that *ll.* 11, 12 rather form a liturgical appendix. Most probably **בְּאֶרֶץ חַיִּים** (*cxvi.* 9) is a corruption of **יְהוָה**. If so, **בְּטוֹב י'** should certainly be **בֵּית י'** (*ת* and *ט* confounded, *ב*, ditto-graphed). Thus we get two variants **בֵּית י'** and **הֲצֵלַת י'**. Considering that **אֱלֹהִים** precedes, we should probably take something from each reading, and restore thus: **אֱלֹהִים יְתַנְּנִי לְרִאֻת | הֲצֵלַת בֵּיתוֹ**. See *exeg.* note.—The gloss (*l.* 12) explains itself.

## PSALM XXVIII.

PENTAMETERS, with caesura; a composite psalm. xxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> is evidently a fragment; after imprecating a just vengeance on the wicked (cp. xxvi. 9 f.), the psalmist probably described his own very different character, and uttered an earnestly believing prayer for his own deliverance 'according to God's righteousness.' *V.* 5, which is a mosaic of borrowed phrases, was apparently inserted by an editor to make the incompleteness of the fragment a little less visible. He must also have added xxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, which is a jubilant hymn of thanksgiving, without reference to any definite circumstances. *V.* 8, 9, which are in a different metre (if they are metrical at all, which Duhm naturally doubts), form a liturgical appendix. It has been asked whether 'Yahwè's anointed one' (*v.* 8) is a prophet (Hitz.), a high priest (*OP*, 233, 350, note<sup>a</sup>), a king (Hu., Del., Bä., &c.), or the entire people (Reuss, Gr., Beer). Certainly Hitzig's identification of the psalmist with the prophet Jeremiah is plausible, if the psalm be a literary whole; cp. *v.* 3 with Jer. ix. 7; *v.* 4 with xxv. 14; and *v.* 5 with xxiv. 6, xlii. 10, xlv. 4. But *vv.* 5 and 8f. are later insertions, and, even apart from this, such points of contact only prove the acquaintance of later psalmists with the Book of Jeremiah. There is also a grave doubt whether כִּישִׁיחוֹ, 'his anointed,' in *v.* 8, is the correct reading.

## XXVIII.—1.

*Of 'Arab-ethan.*

1

- 1 To thee, O my Rock! I cry, | hide not thy face,  
Lest, if thou spurn me, I resemble | those that have gone  
down to the pit.
- Hear my supplicating voice | when I cry unto thee; 2  
[Answer me,] when I raise my hands | towards thy holy  
shrine.
- Destroy me not with the wicked, | with the workers of  
wrong, 3  
Who speak to their neighbours of peace | while mischief  
is in their hearts.
- Give them, O Yahwè! the due of their deeds | and of  
their evil practices, 4  
As their hands have wrought, do thou pay them, | give  
them their deserts.<sup>1</sup>

## XXVIII.—2.

- 1 Blessed be Yahwè! for he has heard | my supplicating  
voice; 6  
Yahwè is my Rock and my Shield, | in him my heart trusts. 7  
With the sound of melody will I magnify him, | with songs  
will I praise him.

<sup>1</sup> Because they regard not the deeds of Yahwè, and the work of his hands,  
he will pull them down, and not build them up.

Yahwè is a Rock for his people, 8  
 He is +rich in+ succour for his loyal one.  
 Do thou give succour to thy people, 9  
 Do thou bless thine inheritance ;  
 Do thou tend them and carry them  
 To the utmost age.

(xxviii.<sup>(1)</sup>). 2. **If thou spurn me,**  
 lit. 'turn in silence from me.' חשה  
 applied to Yahwè, Isa. lxii. 1, 6, lxiv.  
 11, lxv. 6; Hiph. xlii. 14, lvii. 11.—  
*I resemble*, &c. So lxxxviii. 7 (corr.  
 text), cxliii. 7.

3. Cp. xxxi. 23.—4. **Shrine**, דְּבִיר.  
 The 'holy of holies' is meant, = the  
*parakku* in the Assyrian temples. Cp.  
 v. 8, 1 K. viii. 29, Dan. vi. 10; *OP*,  
 320, 331.

6. **Speak . . of peace**, &c. <sup>1</sup> So  
 xxxv. 20, xii. 3, lv. 22. The *gloss*  
 (v. 5) comes partly from Isa. v. 12b,  
 partly from Jer. (see introd.) Note  
 that Yahwè is spoken of in the third  
 person, in spite of v. 3.

קוֹל יְהוָה יִנְחָנוּ, as  
 l. 3. The phrase, however, is  
 (xxx. 23, lxxxvi. 6, cxvi. 1, cxxx. 2,  
 cxl. 7.

(Appendix). 5. **Tend them,**  
 רָעַם. See on xxiii. 1, lxxx. 2.

*Critical Notes.* xxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> 1. יהוה, a scribe's error (note Pasek),  
 corrected afterwards (צור).—M אֶל־תַּחֲרֹשׁ מִמֶּנִּי; tautological. Mis-  
 written for אֶל־תַּסְתֵּר פָּנֶיךָ (cxliii. 7).—4. Insert עֲנֵנִי (Bi.); metre.

M תִּמְשְׁכֵנִי. This use of מִשַּׁךְ is unexampled. Read probably  
 (ד became כ; cp. בכור for בדור, 2 S. xix. 44).

7. Insert יהוה (G<sup>a</sup> c. a; Bi.).

xxviii.<sup>(2)</sup> 2. M עָנִי; G βοηθός μου = עֲזָרִי. Rather צָרִי (see on App.,  
 l. 1).

3. M וְנִעְזַרְתִּי וַיַּעֲלֵנִי לְבִי. G και ἐβοηθήθηκα καὶ ἀνέθαλεν ἡ σὰρξ μου, i.e.  
 'וְנִי'. Here ז in the second word of the text has dropped out,  
 while שארִי is a corruption of [מ]שִׁירִי in v. 7b, which changed places  
 with לְבִי. G's text is evidently worthless. But is M's text very much  
 better? It is plausible to take וַיַּעֲלֵנִי as a (preferable) variant to וְנִעְזַרְתִּי.  
 But וַיַּעֲלֵנִי לְבִי is not enough for the first half of l. 3, nor would לְבִי have  
 been repeated so soon; we need not therefore consider how to emend  
 v. 4 as to form a parallel to וַיַּעֲלֵנִי לְבִי. We must, of course, correct M,  
 without help from G, simply by remembering the common errors of  
 scribes, and assuming that שִׁיר in l. 4 is right. The remedy is plain.  
 Read בָּקוֹל זְמֶרָה אֲנִלְלֵנִי. קוֹל fell out, owing to the measures of לְבִי.  
 s a corruption of וּבְזִמְרָה = 'ובזמ' = וַיַּעֲלֵנִי לְבִי, of 'נו'

4. Here *מְשִׁירִי* comes from *[ב]שִׁירִים*, and *אֶהְדֹּנִי* from *אֶהְלֵלְנִי*. The supposed parallels for *אֶהְדֹּנִי* are untenable (see *JBL*, 1899, pp. 210 f.). *l.l.* 3, 4 are now parallel to *lxix.* 31.

(App.) 1. M *יְהוָה עֵן*. Soon after follows *וּמִעֵן מ'* (for which G reads *מִיָּנִי*) is a correction of *עֵן*. But a more probable correction is *צֶר*. What divine title could take the precedence of 'Rock' (see *xviii.* 3)? *ז* and *ר*, *ע* and *צ* are confounded. Similarly *xlvi.* 2, *lix.* 10, 18, *lxxxi.* 2, *cxviii.* 14.—M *לְמו*. Read *לְעַמּוֹ* (cp. *xxix.* 11), with some MSS. Bö., Ol., Hu., Kr., Dy., Gr., Bi., Kön., &c., after G S. Cp. on *Isa.* xxxv. 8 (*SBOT*).

2. *מְשִׁיחֵנוּ*. Read probably *חֲסִידוֹ*; see on *ii.* 2, *xx.* 7*a*, *lxxxiv.* 10, *cv.* 15.

## PSALM XXIX.

**TETRAMETERS.** If stanzas 2-4 stood alone, we might call this a hymn on the glory of God as exhibited in the thunder-storm. But in spite of Goethe's splendid development of hints derived from this psalm: in its traditional form (see Prologue to *Faust*<sup>1</sup>), the reference to the divine kingship in *v.* 10 at once makes it improbable that this was all that the poet intended. Theophanies too are commonly described under the image of a thunder-storm, to which we may add that another psalmist certainly interpreted Ps. xxix. as relative to the final consummation of the history of Israel and the world—the visible assumption by Yahwè of his sovereignty (see *xcvi.*). A corrected text of *v.* 10*a* confirms this writer's interpretation, and makes the reference to Yahwè's manifested sovereignty still more obvious, and a corrected text of *v.* 1*a*, which is based on the parallelism of many other psalms, and avoids the exegetical difficulty inherent in the traditional text, and also of that enigmatical passage *v.* 9*f*, finally removes all obscurity from the situation intended in the psalm. It may briefly be described thus:—Israel's waiting-time is over; Yahwè has announced himself by mighty acts as the king of Israel and the world. He now sends a message to the survivors of the Jerahmeelites; it is conveyed by a thunder-storm which bursts over the Jerahmeelite country to the south of Palestine. A vivid description is given of the awe-inspiring phenomena of the storm, and the sons of Zion and Jerahmeel are called upon (at least, according to a plausible conjecture) to join in singing praise to the great king; the latter, it is true, are also summoned to bring tribute. The two last lines sum up the grounds of this celebration. Yahwè is now visibly the king of the whole world, and his dominion will last for evermore. In a brief liturgical appendix the community prays for the realization of this glorious vision. Ps. *xcvi.* (see *introd.*) is parallel.

There is therefore no occasion to regard our psalm as specially mythological in its phraseology. For the literary revival of a mythological interest in post-exilic times (*OP*, 202) there is abundant evidence (cp. on *xix.* 1-7), but the representation of thunder as 'Yahwè's voice' is too common and conventional to prove this; the inferior heavenly beings, of whom we hear in *Job* i. 6, ii. 1, disappear from the text of our psalm.

The supposed reference to the Deluge in *l.* 21 is also illusory. But there is a reference (*l.* 5) to the waters of the super-celestial ocean, which indicates an acquaintance with *Gen.* i. (P).

According to the title in G—*ἐξ ὁδοῦ (ἐξ ὁδοῦ) σκηνῆς (= σκηνοπηγίας)*, our psalm was sung in the time of the second temple on the last day (*ἐξ ὁδοῦ*, *Lev.* xxiii. 6) of the Feast of Booths (but cp. *ZATW*, 1902, p. 130). Now, however, it is used as a Pentecost psalm.

<sup>1</sup> Doch ihr, die ächten Göttersöhne,  
Erfreut euch der lebendig reichen Schöne, etc.

*Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.*

1

1 Ascribe unto Yahwè, O ye sons of Jerahmeel,

Ascribe unto Yahwè glory and strength :

Ascribe glory, O ye Ishmaelites, unto Yahwè,

2

Worship Yahwè, Rehoboth and Cush.

The voice of Yahwè +sounds+ over the great waters,

3

[Yahwè,] the God of glory, thunders :

[His] voice Yahwè [utters] with power !

• 4

[His] voice Yahwè [utters] with majesty !

The voice of Yahwè breaks the cedars,

• 5

10 Yahwè shatters the cedars of Gebalon (?) ;

He causes Gebalon to skip like a calf,

6

Sirion like a young wild ox.

The voice of Yahwè cleaves [the rocks,]

7

[The stones he cleaves with] fiery flashes ;

The voice of Yahwè makes the wilderness to tremble,

8

The wilderness of Kadesh Yahwè makes to tremble.

The voice of Yahwè shakes the oaks to and fro,

9

[The trees of] the forests Yahwè strips :

20 \* \* \* \*

[? Ye sons of Zion, exult in your king,]

Ye sons of Jerahmeel, chant hymns to his glory.

His seat Yahwè has taken to judge the world ;

10

For ever will Yahwè hold his seat as king.

*Liturgical Appendix.*

May Yahwè endow his people with strength !

11

May Yahwè bless his people with welfare !

**1. Ye sons of Jerahmeel.**

At the point of time assumed by the psalmist the 'lighting down' (Isa. xxx. 9) of Yahwè's 'arm' has taken place, and the surviving Jerahmeelites are expected to do homage to their all-righteous sovereign (cp. xviii. 45, lxv. 3, also xcvii. 2). Another psalmist (xcvi. 7) seems to paraphrase by [אַרְמִים] מְשַׁפְּחוֹת עֲמִים. The ordinary reading (sec. crit. n.) is most

inappropriate, as Ol. long ago saw. There is no parallel (except indeed xcvii. 7, which seems to be corrupt) for such an assumption of authority over superhuman beings. And strange in the highest degree is the direction to 'worship Yahwè in sacred adornment' (so M in *vi.* 26). Even earthly worshippers would not need to be reminded of the necessity of putting on festal attire ; and to the celestials the reminder would be worse than needless.

4. Almost all critics retain M's **בהדרת קדש**, and render 'in sacred attire.' But does the phrase **ה' ק' ד'** mean this elsewhere? In 2 Ch. xx. 21 should we not render 'praising the sacred (or, divine) Majesty (*i.e.* the Ark, see lxxviii. 61) when it went forth'? The context, however, does not favour a similar rendering here. See crit. n.

5. **The voice of Yahwè, *i.e.* thunder, with its attendant lightning and whirlwind.** Cp. lxxviii. 34.—*The great waters, i.e.* not the Mediterranean Sea (Schröder, Bā.), nor the storm-clouds (Del., Hu., Driv., &c.), but the 'waters above the heavens' (cxlviii. 4; cp. on civ. 3); so already ed. 1, after Reuss; Duhm agrees.

9–12. It is usually supposed that the storm passes from Lebanon in the north to Kadesh (*l.* 16) in the south. This, however, is a mistake. The psalm is altogether concerned with the Jerahmeelites. 'Gebalon,' which is often confounded with 'Lebanon,' was possibly a general term for the mountains on the southern border of Palestine (|| 'Sirion'). See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Sirion.'—*Like a calf*; cp. cxiv. 4, 6.—*Like a young wild ox*, which climbs the mountains with ease (so Assyrian evidence).

13. **Cleaves the rocks, &c., *i.e.* the rocks of the stony mountain-**

plateau to the S. of the Negeb (see 'Negeb,' *Enc. Bib.*). — 15 f. **יְחִיל**. So Sirach xliii. 17 (IHeb.), but with **מַדְבָּר** for **אֲרָצוֹ**.

17. **Shakes the oaks.** Cp. Isa. vii. 2b. The poet ascribes all the effects of the storm to 'Yahwè's voice' (see on *l.* 5). According to M it is the premature calving of the hinds (**אֵילֹת**) which is referred to: cp.

Ewald's note. But elsewhere it is inanimate nature which is referred to, nor would the timid hinds have been the one exception to the rule.

21–24. See introd. The received text of *l.* 22 may have arisen under the influence of Isa. vi. 3. The editor doubtless thinks of the heavenly palace of Yahwè (xi. 4, xviii. 7). But the psalmist has in his mind the capital city of Yahwè's earthly empire. 'To judge the world' means 'to rule the nations.'—*His seat, &c.* Cp. viii. 8, ix. 5, 8. There is no reference either to the Deluge (Del., Bā., &c.) or to the heavenly ocean (Reuss, Du.: cp. *l.* 5). Such an abrupt reference to the Deluge is very improbable, while to explain **לַמַּבּוּל** as if it meant 'in his upper

chambers which are on (**עַל**) the flood' is too bold. See crit. n. On the Appendix, cp. xxviii. 8.

**Critical Notes.** 1. M **בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים**; 'O ye divine ones'? But see on lxxxix. 7. Some MSS. (Kenn., de R.) have **ב' אֱלֹהִים**; G **εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς** (so J S); cp. perhaps Hos. xiv. 2b. This is a mere alteration to improve the sense. Read **בְּנֵי יִרְחָמְאֵל**.

4. Some change appears necessary. **בְּחֻצֹת ק'** (G S) is plausible, but is opposed by the ||, xcvi. 8 f. In both passages read probably **רְחֹבוֹת וְכוּשׁ**. Rehoboth and Cush are representatives of the Jerahmeelite race.

5. In *v.* 3b M has **י' עֲלֵמִים רַבִּים**, a variant to the first clause, which supplies the missing word **רַבִּים**.—6. Insert **יְהוָה** (cp. *l.* 10).—7 f. Read **קוֹלָו**, and insert **יְתֵן**.—9 f. Read (twice) **יִשְׁבֵּר** (cp. *ll.* 15 f.). **לִבְנוֹן**, *i.e.* a southern Lebanon, is possible, but see next note.

10 ff. For **לִבְנוֹן** and **הַלְבָּנוֹן** read **נִבְלֹן**? (see on lxxviii. 16 f.); transfer **נִבְ** from *v.* 6b to *v.* 6a, and read **וַיִּרְקֹד** (Bi., We.). The

reading וירקידם suggests that וירקיד was originally followed by a miswritten ירחמאל (ל=ד; ח=ק) שריון. שריון is a needless correction.

13 f. Insert סלעים יחצב ב (צב precedes) and צרים. Nearly so Bickell, Duhm.

17. M יהולל, transitive, against Job xxxix. 1. Read יקלקל (Ezek. xxi. 26).—M אילות. Against this, see above. Lowth, Secker, Street, Thrupp, Dy., Gr., Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Du. read אילות, but this plur. is nowhere found. Read perhaps אילים.

18. Read perhaps יערי יחשף עצי; י' יחשף עצי easily fell out before יע. M's יערות was influenced by אילות; i.e. first אילים was corrupted into אילות, and then this produced יערות.

21. Supply conjecturally from cxlix. 2, בני ציון גילו במלככם, in antithesis to l. 22. The Israelites and Jerahmeelites are henceforth at one as servants of Yahwè (cp. lxvi. 2-4).

22. M ובהיכלו פלו אמר כבוד, i.e. 'in his upper sanctuary all his ministers utter "Glory" before him' (T)? But can this be expressed in so few words? And is the sense suitable (see above)? Read ובהיכלו אמר כבוד (cp. ll. 1-4). Other cases exist elsewhere of the confusion of זמר and אמר.

23 f. On M's למבול see *Psalms*<sup>(1)</sup>, pp. 379 f. Sense and metre gain by correcting it into לשפט תבל. שפט must have become illegible; לתבל was then conjecturally altered into למבול.—Read

## PSALM XXX.

SIX stanzas, each of three tetrameters, and one closing dimeter. Pss. vi. and cxvi. are strikingly parallel. The prayer in ll. 15-20 is like an amplification of that in vi. 6, and the saying on the change from sorrow to joy of the similar saying in cxvi. 5. The title apparently connects it with a dedication festival, and most moderns (see e.g. Wellh., *Skizzen*, vi. 171 f.) agree in fixing on that described in 1 Macc. iv. 52 ff., which was the origin of a permanent institution (*τὰ ἑγκαίνια*, John x. 22). חנכת הבית is therefore supposed to be a later addition to the title, though if so it ought to have come at the end. According to *Sopherim* xviii. 2 it was anciently sung at this festival. But there is no parallel for such a reference to a quite late institution in a psalm-heading, and experience warns us to distrust appearances in the headings. The common view of this obscure phrase (adopted in *OP*) is wrong, simply because the text is incorrect. See Introduction.

The 'speaker is not an individual, as Hitzig, Duhm, and even Beer suppose, but the inner circle of the righteous 'poor,' which sometimes (e.g. xxii. 23. xxxii. 6) distinguishes itself from the great mass of Jews who, not being transgressors (פשעים) or traitors (בנדים), may be called חסידים (*hasidim*, not yet a party-name), but who need to be stirred up and instructed. Note the parallelism between l. 13 and xviii. 37. Hitzig was struck by an apparent resemblance between the situation of the psalmist and that of Jeremiah at a critical period (he compared at one time Jer. xxxvii. 11 ff., at another Jer. xxxviii. 1-16). See the remarks against a similar theory on Ps. xxxv.

*Marked : Supplication of Sabbath. Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

- 1 I extol thee, O Yahwè, | for thou hast raised me +from  
the ðepth+, 2  
And not suffered the Arabians | to rejoice over me.  
O Yahwè my God, | I cried unto thee, 3  
And thou didst heal me.
- O Yahwè ! thou hast brought up | my soul from Sheol, 4  
My life thou hast drawn up | from among those sunk in  
the pit.
- ¶ Chant psalms to Yahwè, | ye his loyal ones, and give thanks 5  
To his holy name.
- For if, when angry, he is furious, | when appeased he  
shows us favour ; 6
- 10 Weeping +has its turn+ at eventide, | but mirth +comes+  
in the early morning.
- I indeed had said, | so careless was my heart, 7  
' I shall never be shaken.'
- But behold, in thy fury | thou madest mine ancles to fail, 8  
Thou didst hide thy face, | I was filled with dismay :  
I said, ' I shall not see thee, | O Yahwè my God,  
In the land of the living.
- What gain will my blood bring thee, | my going down into  
the pit ? 10
- Can the +realm of+ dust give thee thanks, | or declare thy  
faithfulness ?
- Hear, O Yahwè, | be favourable, O my God, 11
- 20 Be to me a succour.'
- My wailing thou hast changed | into dancing and [singing], 12  
Hast loosed my sackcloth, | and girded me with joy,  
That my lyre unto thee | may make ceaseless melody,<sup>1</sup> 13  
+Yea,+ for ever will I thank thee.

1. **Drawn me up**, from Sheol (l. 5 ; cp. lxxxviii. 4-6). Clearly the national death and resurrection are referred to (cp. Hos. xiii. 1, vi. 2).—  
4. *Didst heal*. For the figure, cp. Dt. xxxii. 29, ' I wound, and I heal ' ; Ex. xv. 26, Isa. vi. 10, Hos. vii. 1, xi. 3, Ps. vi. 3, xli. 5, &c.—*His name*.

Properly יְהוָה is the invocation of a divine name in worship, with the recital of the deity's titles to praise and gratitude (vi. 6, cii. 13, cxlv. 7 ; and cf. the *zīkr* of the Moslems, Hughes, *Dict. of Islam*, 703 ff.) ; then the name itself, as here, cf. xcvi. 12, Ex. iii. 15, Hos.



xii. 6. So Ass. *zikru* (constr. *zikir*), 1. the calling of a name, 2. a name.—10. Cp. cxxvi. 5. The language is proverbial, and may be applied to the ordinary vicissitudes of life. Here, however, there is a special Messianic reference. The 'early morning' is the last great deliverance which Israel will need to experience. When permission was given to rebuild the temple, it seemed as if the Messianic day had dawned (cp. *vv.* 11, 12). But trouble returned, and again Israel was face to face with the danger of national extinction. Now 'mirth' has returned, and

Israel trusts that this time he will be able to 'thank God for ever' (*l.* 24).—11. *So careless . . .* Cp. on xxxix. 4.—12. *I shall never . . .* So x. 6, xvi. 8, lxii. 3, 7.—13. *Mine ancles.* Israel speaks. Cf. xviii. 37 (the people, not the Messiah, nor David, is the speaker).—15 f. Cf. xxvii. 13, Isa. xxxviii. 11a.—17. *My blood.* Clearly not the death of an individual by violence is meant, but national extinction. In *l.* 4 the figure of sickness is employed (see above).—18.—See on vi. 6, and ('dust') *q* xxii. 30.

*Critical Notes.* 2. M אִיבִי. Read perhaps עֲרִבִים, the psalm being so vivid.

6 f. For חִיְתִי מְשִׁיחַ read חִיְתִי מְשִׁיחַ (xviii. 17). מֶשֶׁ fell out between ית and יתי, which indeed coalesced. נִי comes from a dittographed מ.—Read מִיֹּרְדִי (Kt.), with G Θ S. Kr. מִיֹּרְדִי postulates a new infin. יֹרֵד, in spite of *l.* 17.

9 f. M בְּרֵנֶּ בְּאֶפֶס חַיִּים בְּרֵנֶּ. The antithesis is imperfect; חַיִּים can neither be rendered 'a life time' nor 'life eternal.' Isa. lix. 7, 8, is not parallel. G ὁπῆς, which is not נֶעְרָה (Gr.), but רָנוּ (Herz). Read 'בְּרֵנֶּ בְּאֶפֶס יִחְנְנֵנוּ בֵּר.' in חַיִּים easily arose out of נָנוּ.—Omit יִלֵּן, as unsuitable and unmetrical. It is a corruption of a dittographed לִבְכֹּר.

11. M בְּשִׁלּוֹתִי, for בְּשִׁלּוֹתִי (Hu., Sta., &c.) a doubtful assumption. Ol. suggests reading תִּי. But metre requires two beats. Read בְּשִׁלּוֹת לִבִּי and לִבִּי לֹת confounded.

13. M יְהוָה בְּרִצְוֹנְךָ הֶעֱמַדְתָּ לְהַרְרִי עֵז, which Bā. renders, '... thou hadst strongly founded my mountain' (*i.e.* Zion); עֵז, הֶעֱמַדְתָּ, very strange. T, לְהַרְרִי עֵז (cf. Ibn Ezra), so too Hu. If we go so far, we must also read הֶעֱמַדְתָּנִי, with Riehm, Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Kau., We. [*SBOT*], or הֶעֱמַדְתָּי (Giesebr., We. in *Skizzen*). But the sense requires a transition to Yahwē's anger. Read, with Gr., הִמְעַדְתָּה (same error in Ezek. xxix. 7). Gr. also reads בַּחֲרוֹנְךָ; it is easier, however, to correct בְּרִצְוֹנְךָ; ז became צ, ג became נ. Also for יְהוָה we must certainly read וְהִנֵּה, and for לְהַרְרִי עֵז (which Gr. keeps) כְּרִסְסִי (xviii. 37; cp. on x. 6). ק passed into ה, ס into ע, ר was dittographed, and ז inserted. [Tradition wavers; G S read לְהַרְרִי].

\* 15 f. M אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה אֶקְרָא וְאֵלֵי יְהוָה אֶתְחַנֵּן. The requirements both of metre and of sense are imperfectly satisfied. Something much more

forcible is required to link *ll.* 13 f. to *ll.* 17, 18. We can see from *ll.* 17 f. that the psalmist either takes suggestions from or gives suggestions to the author of the psalm of Hezekiah. Let us then suppose another point of contact between the two poems. Read *אֲמַרְתִּי לֹא אֶרְאֶה יְהוָה* (Isa. xxxviii. 18). This became indistinct. *לֹא* became *לִי* (in *אֵלֶיךָ*). *אֶרְאֶה* became *אֶקְרָא*. *אֱלֹהֵי* became *וְאֵל*. *בָּאֶרֶץ* became *אֶת הַהֵימָן* (cf. *l.* 9 *b*). *אֶתְרַתִּי* came off badly; it is only represented by *אֶךְ* in *אֵלֶיךָ*.

•9-21. Read *חֲנִנִי אֱלֹהִים*, and for *לִמְחוּל וְלִשְׁמִיר* read *לִמְחוּל לִי*. In 19, 20, G 2 give perfect (cf. Hi.). Cf. G iv. 2.

23. •M *כְּבֹד*, *i.e.*, acc. to Bā., 'praise,' as in cxlix. 5(?). Read *כְּבוֹדִי* (Gr.). G *ἡ δόξα μου, καὶ μὴ κατανύω*, from which Hu., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We., Du. adopt *כְּבוֹדִי* (but see on vii. 6). Herz, *לִמְעַן אֹמַר כְּבוֹדֶךָ וְלֹא אֲדַם*.

## PSALM XXXI.

**HEXAMETERS.**—Unoriginal in form as this psalm may be, it expresses (at least, its kernel, *vv.* 9-19) a very definite state of mind. Depressed, despised, slandered, insulted, persecuted, the speaker pours out his heart to Yahwē. In spite of his sighs and tears (which are 'before Yahwē,' *l.* 22) he still trusts on, for his past history has been to him a revelation of Yahwē's character. The admixture of an eucharistic element (*vv.* 2-9, 20-25) calls for remark. Are these thanksgivings anticipative? Are they not rather an indication of the unreflecting, mechanical manner in which the original psalm (*vv.* 9-19) was edited? Duhm, however, thinks that the fault belongs to the original writer, and the uncertainty is such that we can hardly venture on a disintegration of the psalm.

Who are the enemies referred to? Chiefly the idolatrous foreign oppressors of Israel (Arabian Misrites, *l.* 27); in *v.* 12, however, besides neighbouring peoples, those members of the Jewish people who have made dangerous concessions to non-legal or even pagan usages may be intended. Pious Israel ('thy servant,' *v.* 17) is therefore the speaker (see *vv.* 7, 15, 19-21); the reference to the speaker's 'guilt' in *v.* 11*b* arises from a slight corruption of the text.

The complaints remind us occasionally of the Books of Job and Jeremiah; Jeremiah has indeed been imagined to be the author (Hitzig). Cp. *v.* 11 with Jer. xx. 18; *v.* 18 with Jer. xvii. 18; cp. also *v.* 23 with Lam. iii. 54. Most of the earlier critics add *v.* 14*a*, Jer. xx. 10 to this list. But, as Bickell has seen, the words which now stand in *v.* 14*a*, and which are both unmetrical and ill-adapted to the context, are a later insertion (cp. on lxxix. 6 f.); probably they are also corrupt (see note). The psalm (see *ll.* 9, 28) is quoted from in Jon. ii. 4, 9. See also on Ps. lxxi. The probable reference to Ezek. xxxii. 19 ff. (see on *l.* 20) should also be noted.

Theodore of Mopsuestia acutely describes this psalm as 'a prayer of the people in Babylon for return.' With more probability Bā. and Beer refer it to the time of Nehemiah, when the Jewish community was harassed by a variety of opponents. This suggests an explanation of the difficult phrase *בְּעֵיר מְצוֹר* (*v.* 22); the words, however, are more than probably corrupt. Duhm on the other hand, reckons this among the latest products of the Psalter. This would be a safer view if, like Ps. xxxiii., the psalm had no title, and surely it is difficult to say positively that the phrases of the psalm cannot have already become conventional at the close of the Persian period. Perhaps too *vv.* 9-19 formed the original psalm, and the rest was added later (see above).

*Deposited. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.*

1

1 In thee, O Yahwè, I take refuge ; | let me not be disappointed for aye !

2

Rescue me in thy righteousness ; | \* \* \* \*

Bend down thine ear to me, | deliver me speedily, [O Yahwè !]

3

Be to me a sheltering rock, | from the sons of Miṣsur deliver me.

Yea, thou art my high rock, my stronghold, | \* \* \* \*  
And for thy name's sake, do thou lead me, | do thou sustain me, [O Yahwè].

4

Free me from the net which they have hidden for me ; | thou art my shield, [O Yahwè].

5

To thy keeping I commit my breath, | my deliverer, thou faithful God !

6

The Miṣrites and Ishmaelites oppose me, | as for me, I trust in Yahwè.

7

10 I will exult and rejoice in thy kindness, | \* \* \* \*

8

For my misery thou hast seen, | thou knowest the pains of my soul,

Thou hast not delivered me into the Arabians' hand, | but hast put my feet in an ample space.

9

Take pity on me, Yahwè, for I am in trouble, | \* \* \* \*  
Mine eye is sunken with sorrow, | my soul and my body [are terrified].

10

Yea, my life is used up with anguish, | my years [disappear] in sighing ;

11

My strength fails through my misery, | and my bones [are burned up] like hay.<sup>1</sup>

To my fellows I am a mark for insult, | to my neighbours a thing to toss the head at,

12

[My kinsfolk] and acquaintance keep away +from me+, |  
\* \* \* \*

Those that see me abroad [abhor me, | those that pass by] flee from me :

20 I am accounted as the dead Jerahmeelites, | I am become like those mortally wounded with the sword.<sup>2</sup>

13

<sup>1</sup> (My bones are fallen away) through the insulting of my foes.

<sup>2</sup> For I hear on all sides the chatter of the Arabians, | of Jerahmeel, of Ishmael.

- But as for me, in thee, O Yahwè, do I trust, | I profess,  
 'Thou art my God': 15  
 Before thee are all my tears;<sup>1</sup> | make thy face to shine  
 upon thy servant.<sup>2</sup> 16, 17  
 Let me not be shamed, for I invoke thee; | let the wicked<sup>3</sup>  
 be given up to Sheol, 18  
 Let the calumnious lips be struck dumb, | which speak  
 against the righteous in haughtiness!<sup>4</sup> 19  
 . How rich is thy liberality to those that fear thee, | thy  
 recompense to those that make thee their refuge! 20  
 In the covert of thy wings thou hidest them, | +yea,+ in a  
 shelter from the tongues of the Arabians. 21  
 Blessed be Yahwè! for he has shown me singular kind-  
 ness | in the midst of Arabians and Miṣrites. 22  
 But I—in my consternation, I had said, | I am driven away  
 from thy presence. 23  
 Surely thou heardest my voice,—+yea,+ my supplication  
 when I cried unto thee.  
 30 +Therefore+ love Yahwè, all ye his loyal ones, | \* \* \* \* 24  
 Yahwè keeps faith to the upright, | and requites those  
 that show haughtiness.  
 \* \* \* \*

*Liturgical Appendix.*

Be strong, take courage, | all ye that wait for Yahwè!

1-6. Full of conventional, but not, therefore, meaningless phraseology. Cp. vii. 2, xi. 2, xxv. 2, 20, xvii. 6<sup>b</sup>, xviii. 3, xxiii. 3 (note on כִּרְכַּל), iv. 23. Lines 1-5 have been prefixed to

x. 12). Cp. 'breath of life,' Gen. ii. 7, vi. 17.

9. Surely Jon. ii. 9 alludes to our psalm, not our psalm to that of Jonah (Duhm).—12. *In an ample space.* Cp. iv. 2, xviii. 20, xxvi. 12.—11.

8, 11, 12. Theodoret sees here a reference to past deliverances as the ground of present confidence. But the perfects may be expressions of confidence in the future. In l. 8, however, פְּרִיתָה seems to be corrupt. *To thy keeping*, lit. 'to thy hand,' finer than 'to thy hands' (G, Lk. xxiii. 46). In Lk. *l.c.* a new turn is given to the sense. *My breath, i.e. my life* (Job

for יַעֲזֹר אֱשֶׁר, as often; G ἔσται.

14. Cp. vi. 7 and 4; *my soul and my body* (בְּנַפְשִׁי), cp. xlv. 26.

17-19. Cp. the descriptions in xxii. 8, xxxviii. 12, xli. 10, xlv. 15, lv. 14, lxix. 9, lxxxviii. 9, 19, Job xix. 13 ff., Isa. liii. 3<sup>b</sup>.

20. It is usual to illustrate and

<sup>1</sup> Snatch me from the hand of mine enemies and from my pursuers.

<sup>2</sup> Succour me in thy kindness, O Yahwè. <sup>3</sup> Be shamed. <sup>4</sup> And scorn.

defend M by Job xix. 14<sup>b</sup>, Hos. viii. 8, Jer. xxii. 28. But the expressions are *not parallel*; those in v. 12a are strange in the extreme. 'I am forgotten like a dead man out of the heart'; מָלֵב is otiose (Duhm compares מָפֶה,

Dt. xxxi. 21, but there מָפֶה adds something to the sense = 'so that the mouth utters it no more'). 'Like a lost or perishing vessel.' Hebrew writers, however, say 'like an unvalued vessel.' Comp. Jer. xxii. 28. The idea, too, of v. 12a is unsuitable. The context shows that the speaker is not forgotten. What is true is that those who insult and abhor him, and who plot against his life, consider him as good as dead. *As the dead Jerahmeelites* (see crit. n.). The reference (as in lxxxviii. 6, cxliii. 3) is to some great slaughterers of Jerahmeelites or Edomites, possibly those mentioned in 2 S. viii. 13, 1 K. xi. 15 f., 2 K. xiv. 7. As l. 20<sup>b</sup> shows, the psalmist is thinking of Ezek. xxviii. 10, xxxi. 17, xxxii. 19 ff. (see *Crit. Bib.*).

21. **Thou art my God.** Israel's public confession of faith (xvi. 2, De. vi. 4).—25. See lvi. 9. The new reading gives a fine sense and one adapted to the context; it relieves us from the double use of 'hand,' and it is linguistically defensible. As a proverb in vague but suggestive English, however, we can, of course, retain the familiar words of A.V., which have been illustrated by Browning in *Rabbi Ben Ezra* (stanza 1), just as A.V.'s equally seductive rendering of a corrupt

reading in cxxvii. 2 has been glorified by Mrs. Browning.

24. Cf. xii. 4, xciv. 4. שָׁקַר, like Ass. *tašgirtu*, may mean 'calumny.'—25. *How plentiful* . . . Cf. xxxvi. 7. The abrupt transition suggests that either the writer corrected or completed his own work in a later mood, or that an editor (a master of metre like himself) did this for him. Line 26 does not indeed flatly contradict l. 24, but it implies that the speaker has taken the calumnies too much to heart. 'Why should Israelites for a moment lose the serenity which befits the dwellers in Yahwè's covert? It was in 'trembling haste' that the psalmist in the name of Israel had spoken so excitedly. Cf. Introd.—26. Cf. lxi. 5, xxvii. 5, Isa. iv. 6. *The tongues of the Arabians*. Cp. v. 14, cxx. 3 f.

28. בַּחֲפוֹי. So cxvi. 11; cp. xxx. 7a. There is an allusion to (b) in Jon. ii. 5. See crit. n.

30. **Love Yahwè.** The inference from Israel's experience is that all Israel's members should worship and obey Yahwè alone. The expression is ritual in its origin; hence the love of Yahwè can be commanded (see *OP*, 378).—31. אֱמוּנִים. G ἀληθείας ἐκζητεῖ Κύριος; also S J Hitz, Del., We., Duhm. 'A T J, followed by Street, Hal. (*Rev. sem.* iii. 36), and Kautzsch, 'the faithful.' Duhm supplies לְאַהֲבֹי; see, however, crit. note.—32. Cp. xxvii. 14, xxxiii. 18<sup>b</sup>, 22<sup>b</sup>.

*Critical Notes.* 3, 6, 7. Restore יהוה (י'), which fell out after י.

4. M לְהוֹשִׁיעֵנִי לְבֵית מְצוּדוֹת. The connexion is on both sides not smooth, and some historical colouring is desirable. Read מְבִי מְצוּר הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי. מְצוּר and בֵּית are sometimes confounded.

6 f. M תִּנְחַנֵּי וּתְנַחֲלֵנִי. Two synonyms. Read וְתִכְלֶלְנִי (lv. 23; Sirach xlv. 24, xlix. 9). See on xxiii. 2. S implies וּתְנַחֲמֵנִי.—M מְעִי. The psalmist has adopted from xviii. 3 צוּר, מְעוֹ, and מְצוּדָה; can he forget to quote מְנִי? G ὑπερασπιστὴς μου.

8. M פְּדִיתָה אוֹתִי; the perfect and the אַת with suffix are both unnatural. Read מִפְּלֹטִי. This became אֶפְדֵּתִי. תִּי was dittographed

and א transferred. פּרִית remained. Omit יְהוּה (י repeated from אות). [Wellh., *Skizzen*, vi. 172, sees the difficulty, and boldly cancels 'פ' א'.]

9. For M's שְׁנֵאתִי, G S J T, Houb., and many moderns (*e.g.* König, *Eint.*, 74) read תִּתְּ. But the whole half-line is suspicious. What can הַשְׁמָרִים mean here (Jon. ii. 5, מִשְׁמָרִים)? And why this isolated reference to idol-worship? Lagarde's correction from Isa. v. 12 is clever, but unsuitable. Halévy is on the right scent, but he only proposes שְׁמִנֹנִי. Probably we should read thus, וַיִּשְׁמַעְאֲלִים מִצָּרִים. Cp. an error in xxv. 19b.

11 f. M בְּצָרוֹת יָדַע בִּי. We's בְּצָרוֹת depends on ix. 10, x. 1, where, however, the pointing is wrong. G ἔσωσας ἐκ τῶν ἀναγκῶν τοῦ ψυχῆ μου, against parallelism. Read עֲצָבוֹת.—M אוֹיֵב. Read עֲרָבִי.

14 ff. Insert נִבְהֵלָה (vi. 4) with Bi.; T, Kenn., Houb. also supply a verb.—Insert פָּנִי (xc. 9). For בְּעֵינִי read בְּעֵינִי (Σ; cp. l. 11) or בְּעֵינִי (G S, Bā., Du.). For עֲשֹׂשׁו (repetition) read נִחַרְךָ (cii. 4).

17. M מִפְּלִצְרֵי הָיִיתִי חֲרָפָה וְלִשְׁכְּנִי מֵאֵד מֵאֵד. Pasek before מֵאֵד. As metre shows, מִכְּלָצִי (moved to v. 11) is an interpolation from vi. 8b. Read לִרְעִי הָיִיתִי חֲרָפָה וְלִשְׁכְּנִי מֵנֹד רֹאשׁ. Lag., Bi., מֵנֹד. But metre requires רֹאשׁ (so xliv. 15). Herz מוֹרָא (before Duhm's work).

18. M חֲדָלוּ קְרוֹבִי וּמִידַעִי; short and poor. Read חֲדָלוּ קְרוֹבִי וּמִידַעִי (cp. Job xix. 14, rightly arranged [see Beer]). חֲדָלוּ fell out.

19 f. M's בָּחוּץ נִדְרוּ מִמֶּנִּי רָאִי evidently contains parts of two half-lines. Complete the first by תַּעֲבֹנִי (Job xix. 19); the second by הֶעֱבָרִים.—M כִּמְת מֵלֵב; most awkward. Cf. lxxxviii. 5 (corr. text), cxliii. 3, and read, comparing בָּלַעַם = יִרְחַמְאֵל

כִּמְתָּ. See exeg. note.—M כִּכְלִי אֵבֶד (so G). Read כִּכְלִי אֵבֶד (Ezek. xxxii. 21, &c.). See on lxxxviii. 6. At this point the Heb. text (M G) makes an insertion, derived from Jer. xx. 10, where (as here) the text is corrupt, and (see *Crit. Bib.*) to be restored thus, כִּי שְׁמִעְתִּי—רַבַּת עֲרָבִים יִרְחַמְאֵל וַיִּשְׁמַעְאֵל. This has been linked to the context by another insertion (see M), opening with בְּהוֹסֵדִם or rather (G T, Gr., La., see on ii. 4) בְּהוֹעֵדִם.

22–24. M בְּיָדֶיךָ עֵתוֹתִי. In 1 Chr. xxix. 30 עֵתִים appears to mean 'critical times,' and if the parallelism prescribed a word with this meaning

in *l.* 25, we should have to read עָתִי with Nowack. But considering 1. that we do not expect such a word in *l.* 25, and 2. that the only other passages (*ix.* 10, *x.* 1) in which the fem. plur. form עֲתוֹת occurs are corrupt, we have no other course but to correct the text. Gr. proposes עֲתָתִי (see on lxxx. 16). But even this does not produce a perfect sense, unless we venture to correct בִּידָד into בִּשְׁמָה. The clue to the true reading is supplied by *lvi.* 9. Read לִנְגִידָה כָּל יְדֻמְעוֹתִי. Then follows a short unmetrical insertion, 'הִצִּילֵנִי וְגו' (*V.* 17a (עֲבָדָד) makes a good parallel to 'I profess, thou art my God.' Again, a little insertion follows ('הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי וְגו'). Verse 18a is right, then comes an inserted יִבְשִׁי. For יִדְמוּ read, not יִרְדּוּ (cf. G S), but יִסְגְּרוּ (cf. *l.* 12, and see on lxxiii. 11).—After עַל־צִדִּיק M G read עֲתָתָךְ, which seems to be a corruption of a dittographed עַל־צִדִּיק. [Duhm omits 'על-צ' as a variant to עֲתָתָךְ.] M G append וְבוֹן.

25 f. M's אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־צָפַנְתָּ is a variant to אִישׁ תִּצְפֶּנֶם (see *v.* 21, M). We need not therefore trouble ourselves to render צָפַן differently in two successive Massoretic verses.—M פָּעִלְתָּהּ. Read פָּעִלְתָּהּ.—M appends נִגְדָה בְּנֵי אָדָם, not a gloss, but miswritten and misplaced. The text is still further disarranged in M by the tautological prefix תִּסְתִּירָם (derived from xxvii. 5); note Pasek.—M פָּנִיָּה. Read כְּנָפֶיָּה (*xvii.* 8, *lxi.* 5), with Goldziher (*Mythos bei den Hebr.*, 137; Eng. tr. 117).—M מִרְכְּסֵי אִישׁ. Assyriology (cp. Del., *Ass. HWB*, s. v. *rikṣu*) cannot justify the impossible רִכְס. Ol. suggests מֵאֲנָשֵׁי רָכִיל (Ezek. xxii. 9; cf. on Ps. xvii. 3). G's ἀπὸ παραχῆς ἀνθρώπων is a mere guess. T's גִּידוּדֵי springs from tradition, but from a faulty one; cf. its rend. of רִכְסִים in Isa. xl. 4. Herz suggests מְרִנּוֹת (cf. Hitz's earlier view). The truth, however, probably is that מִרְכְּסֵי אִישׁ is simply a corrupt and misplaced duplication of מְרִיב לְשֹׁנוֹת עֲרָבִים (for this is probably the true reading) (see on xxxv. 1, xliii. 1).

27. M בָּעִיר מְצוֹר. S ὡς ἐν πολλῇ περιφραγμένῃ. We., מְצוֹר בָּעִיר (or מְצוֹר); Hal., בָּעִיר מְצוֹק. But the analogy of *lx.* 11 leads one to expect the Mišrites to be mentioned. We have also to account for נִגְדָה בְּנֵי אָדָם, now misplaced in *v.* 20. נִגְדָה should probably be בָּקָרָב (see on xxiii. 5). בְּנֵי עֲרָבִים (so read!) is a variant to עֲרָבִים (so read for בָּעִיר, comparing *lv.* 10!). Line 27b should therefore run, בָּקָרָב עֲרָבִים וּמְצָרִים.

28. M נִגְרָתִי (ἀπ. λεγ.). Some MSS. נִגְרָתִי (cp. on lxxxviii. 6). Jon. ii. 5, נִגְרָשְׁתִּי; so E' ἐκβεβλημαι. This is more forcible, and suits עֵי מִנְגֵּד best; so Gr., Hal., Du.

29. M עֲלֵי־תֵר. As Herz points out, G T make this qualify עֵשָׂה; from T he infers a reading יֵתֵר, which (cp. Zech. x. 4) he takes to be a figurative expression for 'ruler.' But is this probable? It is true, the statement produced by עֲלֵי־תֵר ('according to abundance?') does not tally with lxii. 13. G arbitrarily gives τοῖς περισσῶς ποιουσιν ὑπερηφανίαν. We expect something like this,

אֲמוּנִים נִצֵּר יְהוָה לְיֵשֶׁר | וּמִשְׁלֵם כָּל־עֵשָׂה גֵאוּה

32 f. Line 33 does not fit on well to ll. 29, 31, and seems to be an appendix. So B. Jacob (*ZATW*, xvi. 153) and Grimm (*Liturg. App.*, 12).

## PSALM XXXII.

**T**ETRAMETERS (double dimeters). Evidently a composite psalm, for the didactic passage, vv. 8-10, has a new commencement, and is an utterance, not of Israel, but either of the poet or, much more probably, of Yahwè (see on v. 8). It contains an exhortation and a promise addressed to each individual Israelite—the influence of the individualizing educational movement recorded for us in Proverbs is unmistakable. Vv. 3-7 have also often been interpreted in an individualistic sense, and assuming this view to be correct, and that the speaker in vv. 8-10 is the same individual who has (*ex hyp.*) related his experience of the good results of confession of sin in vv. 3-5, we should have no difficulty in maintaining the unity of the psalm. This assumption, however, is untenable, not only from the point of view of a sound exegesis of vv. 8-10, but from that of a careful exegesis of vv. 3-7. If the longer passages of psalms in the same strain are rightly understood as utterances of the pious community (see e.g. vi., xxxi., xxxviii., cii.<sup>1</sup>), we cannot interpret vv. 3-7 differently. The speaker must be Israel, whose body (*i.e.* organization) suffered so severely through calamities, but whom God delivered from the consequences of its sin, as soon as it frankly confessed its guilt (v. 5). The reference is manifestly to the captivity and its consequences, which may be regarded as extending to the time of Nehemiah and Ezra (cp. the confessions of sin in the Books of Nehemiah and Ezra). There may indeed be a flood of fresh troubles before the final deliverance comes, but the preservation of a remnant in the huge trouble of the past gives an assurance that no loyal prayerful Israelite will be washed away by the flood, and Israel as a whole gratefully counts upon the divine guardianship (vv. 6, 7). A liturgical preface (vv. 1, 2) and appendix (v. 11) are added (cp. xli.). For the individualizing application of v. 1 compare the inserted passage xl. 5; also the heading of cii.

The phraseology and ideas of both parts of Ps. xxxii. are characteristically post-exilic. The mere fact that חֲסִיד is used in v. 6 as a class-name is decisive; so too is the extreme sensitiveness of conscience implied in vv. 3-5. Post-exilic also is the conception of the teachership of Yahwè (see *OP*, 236, 249). Nor is the survival of the retribution-doctrine opposed to this, as the Books of Job and Proverbs show. Cp. on Ps. li.—The corruptions of the text have led to much misunderstanding. Observe that only one 'Selah' is correct (v. 7).

### XXXII.—I.

*Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.*

I

*Liturgical Preface.*

Happy is he whose transgression is removed, | whose sin is covered!



- 1 Watch over me, O God ! | pity me, O Yahwè ! 2  
 [For] I am needy, | and my spirit is sad.  
 When thou wast mute at my crying | my frame wasted  
 away, 3  
 For by day and by night fell heavily | thy hand upon me. 4  
 Affrighted was my body | by the heat of thine indig-  
 nation ;<sup>1</sup>  
 I made known my sin, | I covered not my guilt. 5  
 I said, I will confess | my transgressions to Yahwè ;  
 My guilt thou didst remove, | my sin thou didst forgive.  
 For this let prayer be made | by every loyal one to thee ; 6  
 10 When thy floods<sup>2</sup> overflow, | such a one they cannot  
 reach.  
 Thou art unto me a covert, | from my foes mayest thou  
 guard me, 7  
 In the time of favour mayest thou set me free | from [all]  
 those that encompass me.

*Supplement* ['Selah '].

XXXII.—2.

- 1 I will instruct thee and teach thee | the way thou  
 shouldest go, 8  
 I will guide thee by my counsel | in paths that are right.  
 Be not thou like the horse | and the senseless mule, 9  
 Which by bit and bridle | are brought to thy side.  
 Many are the pains | [of the evil-doer and] of the wicked ; 10  
 But he who trusts in Yahwè | with lovingkindness will He  
 encompass him.

*Liturgical Appendix.*

- Rejoice in Yahwè, | and exult, ye righteous, 11  
 Shout ye, and sing for joy, | all ye upright in heart.

(<sup>1</sup>) *Title.* With G transpose  
 (see Introd.) and לָרֹד.

1, 2. This seems to be the cry  
 which afflicted Israel uttered according  
 to *l.* 3. The usual reading in *v.* 2*b* is

'and in whose spirit there is no guile.'  
 This clause, however, does not fit on  
 well to the statement that the forgiven  
 man, whose sin is not reckoned to him,  
 is truly happy. For if 'no guile'  
 means 'no attempt to make oneself

<sup>1</sup> O God.

<sup>2</sup> Great waters.

out better than one is,' this negative characteristic may surely be assumed in the man whom the searcher of hearts has pardoned; besides which 'in whose spirit' should rather be, 'in whose mouth' (Isa. liii. 9). But this is not the only difficulty in M's text, which is very corrupt (see crit. n.).

3. The text reads, 'I was mute,' *i.e.* made no confession of sin. Such backwardness was all the more remarkable because the speaker says (according to M) that he never ceased crying, and because in *v.* 4 God's conduct, not man's, is spoken of. Usually crying (xxii. 2, same word) is a synonym for impassioned prayer, and prayer implies confession of sin; usually too 'silence' is the term for Yahwe's inattention to the distress of his people (xxviii. 1, &c.). Duhm thinks that **שֹׁאֲנִי** means 'the sore sickness which forced a cry of pain from me'; but how can this be?

9 f. See introd. The overflowing waters may be a figure for the divine wrath (Isa. xxx. 28, Nah. i. 8), but more probably (cp. Isa. viii. 7 f.,

xxviii. 2, 15, Jer. xlvii. 2, cp. Dan. ix. 26) here, as in cxxiv. 4 f., an attack on Israel by foreign foes is meant. The exemption promised to the *hāsīd* corresponds to that of the 'believer' in Isa. xxviii. 17.

11 f. The prayer in *ll.* 1 f. is virtually repeated, but in a calmer tone. The phrases are familiar ones; cp. xxvii. 5, xxxi. 21 (**סֶתֶר**); xii. 8, xxv. 21, xxxi. 24 (**נֹצֵר**), lxix. 14, Isa. xlix. 8 (**עֵת רְצוֹן**). 'Encompassing' foes, as iii. 7, xxviii. 6, cxviii. 10-12. The 'time of favour' is the great 'Messianic' deliverance.

xxxii.<sup>(2)</sup> 1 ff. Is it the poet (Calvin, Hu., Du.) or Yahwè (Ol., Ew., Hi., Bi.) who speaks? xxxiv. 12 favours the former view so far as *ll.* 1 f. are concerned; xxv. 8, 12 the latter. But *ll.* 3 f. can hardly be assigned to a human teacher. Israel is likened to domestic animals in Hos. x. 11. xi. 4, Dt. xxxii. 15, &c., and contrasted with them, as here, in Isa. i. 3. See crit. n.

*Critical Notes.* xxxii.<sup>(1)</sup> As we have seen, *v.* 2b is quite out of place here. The second **אֲשֵׁרִי** followed by **אָדָם** is also unexpected; indeed the whole of *v.* 2a appears superfluous after *l.* 1. Nor are *vv.* 1, 2 at all a natural introduction to the following descriptive passage. Either they are a liturgical preface, or (since *v.* 2, as we have seen, is partly superfluous, partly out of place) the true beginning of xxxii.<sup>(1)</sup> underlies M's text of *v.* 2. Our first suspicion rests on **אָדָם**, which word is not unfrequently corrupt, and remembering the frequent severance of words by scribes, we correct **אָדָם לֹא** into **אֱלֹהִים**; **אֲשֵׁרִי** may easily have come out of **שֹׁמֵר [נִי]**. **יְחֻשָׁב** in xl. 18 comes from **חֻשָׁה** (lxx. 2); here, however, it has more probably arisen out of **חֻסָּה**. Read, therefore, **חֻסָּה עָלַי יְהוָה** | **שֹׁמֵרֵי אֱלֹהִים**.

2. Read perhaps **בְּיֶאֱבִיז אָנִי** | **וְרוּחִי מָרָה**

3. **בְּשֹׁאֲנִי** being inconsistent with **כִּי הִחֲרַשְׁתִּי**, Gr. alters it into **בְּשִׁנְנִי**. But **שִׁנְנָה** is not found in the Pss.; **שִׁנְיָה** too (xix. 13) is an *ἀπ. λέγ.* Read **כִּי הִחֲרַשְׁתָּ בְּשׁוּעַתִּי ב'** **ע'**. Omit **כָּל־הַיּוֹמִים** as a variant to **כִּי יוֹמָם** (*l.* 4). For **שׁוּעַתִּי**, see on xxii. 2.

5 f. **מִנְהַפֵּךְ לֶשְׁדִּי** (<sup>?</sup> **בְּחֶרְבִּנִי**) **בְּחֶרְבִּנִי קִיץ**. 'My moisture' (T **רוֹטְבִי**) can only be justified (for **לֶשְׁדִּי**) by a fanciful use of Arabic (see Lexicons); **לֶשֶׁד** in Num. xi. 8 = *ἐγκρίς*, a kind of oil-cake. Hence Ol. and Bi. correct into **לֶשְׁנִי**. But this ought to be followed by **לְחֶרֶשׁ**

(cp. xxii. 16). Nor do they attempt to correct the suspicious *ἀπ. λεγ.* 'חרב. Herz proposes בַּחֲבֵר נָקִיץ (or פֿ-) לִי שְׂדֵי 'Shaddai . . . like a vexed friend.' Surely the right reading is, נִבְהַל בְּשָׂרִי. The changes are all simple, and the sense is good. The בַּחֲרוֹן אַפָּי at the end of v. 4 is probably a corruption of אֱלֹהִים.—M אֹדִיעָה. But a historical present is not natural here. Read הוֹדִיעָתִי (Bi.; cp. G). M's reading was produced by the אֹדֶה in l. 9.

7. M אֹדֶה עָלַי. Contrary to usage; it is not enough to quote לֵהוֹדֶה in Neh. Contrary also to metre. Read אֹדִיעַ (cp. l. 6). לִי in עָלַי represents לִי; the scribe afterwards wrote לִיהוֹה in full after פָּשַׁעִי.

8. M וְאַתָּה נִשְׂאָת עֵינַי חֲטָאתִי סֶלָה (Pasek after וְאַתָּה. The pleonasm חֲטָי is strange; and סֶלָה is hardly to be expected here. Read וְעֵינַי נִשְׂאָת וְחֲטָאתִי סֶלָה. אתה in M is a fragment of a dittographed נִשְׂאָתָה. Nearly so Gr. סֶלָה is misleading, as often (e.g. Pss. xxxix, lxviii.).

9. M לֵעֵת מִצָּא רַק. לֵעֵת is supposed to belong logically to רַק, though separated by three words from it, and לֵעֵת מִצָּא to be equivalent to בְּהַמְצָאָו, Isa. lv. 6. But the three words רַק לֵעֵת מִצָּא present the clearest marks of corruption, nor can רַק possibly mean 'surely.' Several corrections have been offered. (1) One, adopted by the writer in 1887-88, is due to Lagarde. מִצָּאר he takes to be miswritten for מִצָּר. He then continues קוֹל שִׁטָּף. But קוֹל ('at the sound of') is not what we expect. (2) Duhm supposes מִצָּא רַק to be a combination of two readings מִצָּר and מִצּוֹק. (3) Gr. alters רַק into רָצוֹן. I think, however, that we can perhaps improve upon these. מִצָּארק is a corruption of צִנּוֹרִיק (נו = מ), and this word, as also in xlii. 8, is a corruption of שִׁבְלִיק. מִים רַבִּים is a gloss upon this, and לִשְׁטָף is the original out of which לֵעֵת has arisen (ע = ש, ט = ת). Cp. lxix. 16, where שִׁטָּף and שְׂבַלָּת again occur together.

11 f. For מִצָּר read מִצָּרִי.—M רִנִּי פִלֵּט. רִנִּי פִלֵּט both here and in lvi. 8 must be wrong; and רִנִּי also, though attested by G. רִנִּי comes from a second תִּצְרֵנִי, which is a corruption of רָצוֹן. Continue תִּפְלִטֵנִי מִכָּל-מִסּוּבָּי. Cp. G *λύτρωσαι με ἀπὸ τῶν κυκλωσάντων με*.—The 'Selah' seems to state that a supplement is to be made here from another MS (לְשִׁלֵּם).

xxxii.<sup>(2)</sup> 2. M אֵינִי עֹלֶה עִינִי. G *ἐπιστηριῶ ἐπὶ σὲ τοὺς οφθαλμούς μου*, perhaps reading אֵינִי עֹלֶה (?); cp. Schechter and Taylor on the

Heb. text of Sirach iv. 28. But the material is not enough for a double dimeter. We must both correct and fill it up. Read probably **אֲנַחְדָּ בַעֲצָתִי בְּמַעֲגָלִי צָדֵק** (lxxiii. 24, xxiii. 3). **א** is the only remnant of the first word. **עֵינִי** and **עָלִי** are two fragments of **מַעֲגָלִי** (**מ** = **ני**). **ך** in **עָלִיךָ** may come from **ק**, a fragment of **צָדֵק**. Some such restoration is required by the sense. [**עֲצָה** in Prov. xvi. 30 must also be corrupt.]

3 f. **מ** **תָּהִיו**, Read **תָּהִיו** (Gr.).—**מ** **הָבִין**. Read **בִּינָה** (G *σύνεσις*; Gr.).—**מ** **עָדִיו לְבָלוֹם בַּל קָרֵב אֵלָיָהּ**. Surely **עָדִיו**, 'his trappings' (?) cannot be in apposition to **מִתֵּנָה וְרָסָן בַּל** before **קָרֵב** (infin.?) is against usage. Hence von Ortenberg would take **ק** to be a proleptic perfect. He reads **עָדִי יִבְלֵ קָרֵב אֵלָיָהּ**; for the rest he agrees with **M** (*Textkritik*, 6 f.). But **לְבָלוֹם** is a suspicious-looking *ἀπ. λεγ.*, and, not less than **בַּל** which follows, represents **יִבְלֵ** or **יִבְלֵהָ**. As for **עָדִיו**, Herz has rightly seen that **ע** is a corruption of **צ**. He would read **צִידָה לְבָלֵעַ מִבְּלֵ קָרֵב**. But the sense of this is not satisfactory, and metrical requirements must be considered. **עָדִיו** (**צָדִיו**) and **אֵלָיָהּ** both contain elements of a forgotten word, viz. **לְצִדָּה קָרֵב** is intrusive; as was pointed out in ed. 1, it is an interpolation suggested by the faulty reading **עָדִיו בַּל**. Read simply **יִבְלֵ לְצִדָּה**. To defend G's *συναγόμενος αὐτῶν* as a rendering of **מ**'s **עָדִיו**, seems to me extremely difficult. We. refers to **עָרִיךְ**, ciii. 5, which he renders 'thy mouth.' But see note on that passage.

5. Insert **וְלִמְרָעָה**, or the like.—**מ** **הֲרִנֵּנוּ**. The form **הֲרִנֵּן** seems to occur in lxxv. 9, Job xxix. 13 as a trans.; in lxxxii. 2, Dt. xxxii. 43, also in Sirach xxxix. 35, as an intrans., and so also here. It may, however, be imaginary. In our passage metre suggests the irreproachable reading **הֲרִיעֵנוּ וְרִנֵּנוּ**. In Dt. xxxii. 43 read **עִמּוֹ . . עִם רִנֵּנוּ** (see G). The scribe began **הֲרִיעֵנוּ**, but, noticing his error, closed with **נָנוּ**. Out of **הֲרִנֵּנוּ** arose **הֲרִנֵּנוּ**. In Job xxix. 13 read **וּפִי אֵלַי יִבְרַכֵּנִי** (G); *vs.* 12 f. are an interpolation (Budde). Still the corruption was early enough to have existed in the Psalter of Ben Sira.

## PSALM XXXIII.

**T**RIMETERS. The faithful are summoned to praise God for His mercies to Israel, whom the nations had purposed to destroy (*v.* 10). He has delivered His people; no wonder, for He is the Creator (*v.* 6) and knows the secrets of the heart (*v.* 15). Israel's unwarlike character is no disadvantage; it presupposes consciousness of its true and only strength, which is its persistent clinging to Yahwè. The 'purpose' mentioned in *v.* 11a is no doubt the establishment of

The psalm is quasi-alphabetic, containing twenty-two couplets (cp. xxxviii. f., cxlvi., Lam. v.); there is a clearly marked division after v. 11 (ll. 21 f.). It is full of points of contact in ideas and phraseology with late writings: כִּנֹּס, however, must not be used as evidence (see on l. 13). It can hardly be of earlier composition than Pss. cxliv.—cl., which were collected and perhaps composed in the Asmonæan period; its resemblances to these psalms (cp. also cxv. 9–11, cxviii. 15, 20) are manifest. The phrase 'a new song' in v. 3, and the tenses in vv. 10, 13, 14 suggest a recent time of upheaval of nations, in which Israel had been fortunate, while (v. 16) kings and great warriors had fallen. Even apart from this, the extreme imitativeness of the psalm pushes its date further down than those among which it is placed.

That the psalm must be pre-exilic because of מִלֵּךְ in v. 16 (Bä.), is a hasty inference. מִלֵּךְ is quite indefinite. An early Maccabæan date is not inconceivable.

There are points of contact with psalms plausibly regarded as Maccabæan. If Judas Maccabæus is correctly represented in 1 Macc., he had faith in the divine power to give victory to those who were not strong, and he, and still more his supporters, could have joined in singing vv. 16, 17 (see *OP* 195). Still an earlier date is by no means impossible. Vv. 16, 17 might refer to the kings overthrown by Alexander the Great, or perhaps to the wars of the Diadochi (so Halévy, *Rev. sémi.* iii. 45), and v. 10 to the cruelty of Artaxerxes Ochus towards the Jews, if this can safely be regarded as historical. The truth is that suspicions of a plot to destroy their national existence, and somewhat premature thanksgivings for full deliverance, are oft-repeated phenomena in the sacred lyric poetry of the Jews.

The circumstance that the psalm has no heading, either in the Hebrew or in 'Ašō (Origen), has caused some surprise. Has לָדוֹד dropped out ('very probably,' Bä.)? or were xxxii. and xxxiii. originally one psalm (Venema, cp. ix.–x.; xlii.–xliii.)? For the former view, G's heading, τῷ Δαυὶδ, might be adduced, if we could place more confidence in G's accuracy in such particulars. For the latter, the strong resemblance between xxxii. 11 and xxxiii. 1 may seem to plead (cp. Grätz); but the metres of xxxii. and xxxiii. differ. More probably xxxiii. was inserted after xxxii. by the latest editor just because of this (accidental) resemblance, and also because of the point of contact between v. 18 and xxxiv. 16; moreover, xxxiii. and xxxiv. may both be classed as alphabetic psalms.

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 1  | Sing for joy in Yahwè, ye righteous !                  | 1 |
|    | The song of praise befits the upright.                 |   |
|    | Give thanks to Yahwè with the lyre ;                   | 2 |
|    | With the lute and the horn play unto him.              |   |
|    | Sing unto him a new song ;                             | 3 |
|    | Strike the strings aloud with the clang +of the horn+. |   |
|    | For the word of Yahwè is right,                        | 4 |
|    | And all his doing is in faithfulness.                  |   |
|    | He loves righteousness and justice,                    | 5 |
| 10 | The earth is full of the lovingkindness of Yahwè.      |   |
|    | By the word of Yahwè were the heavens made,            | 6 |
|    | And all their host by the breath of his mouth.         |   |
|    | He stored the sea in +vast+ pitchers,                  | 7 |
|    | He laid up the ocean in treasures.                     |   |
|    | Let all the earth fear Yahwè ;                         | 8 |
|    | Of him let all the world's people be in awe.           |   |

- For he spake, and it came into being ; 9  
 He commanded, and there it stood.  
 Yahwè has annulled the purpose of the nations, 10  
 20 He has foiled the designs of the peoples.  
 Yahwè's purpose will stand for ever, 11  
 The designs of his heart to all generations.
- Happy the nation whose God is Yahwè, 12  
 The people he has chosen for himself as a heritage.  
 Out of heaven Yahwè looks down, 13  
 He beholds all the human kind ;
- \*From his firm habitation he gazes 14  
 Upon all who dwell on the earth—  
 He who knows the recesses of their hearts, 15  
 30 Who takes note of all their works.
- A king is not victorious through a great army, 16  
 A warrior does not win escape by mightiness.  
 A horse is not to be trusted for victory, 17  
 Nor can it rescue by its great strength.
- Nay, the eye of Yahwè is on those that fear him, 18  
 On those who put their hope in his lovingkindness,  
 To deliver their soul from pestilence, 19  
 And to keep them alive in famine.
- Our soul waits on for Yahwè ; 20  
 40 He is our Rock and our shield.  
 Yea, our heart rejoices in him, 21  
 Yea, we trust in his holy name.
- Let thy lovingkindness, O Yahwè, rest upon us, 22  
 According as we have put our hope in thee.

1 f. Terms for pious Israel ; cf. xxxii. 11 (appendix), xcvi. 12, cxlvii. 1, and especially cxi. 1. On instruments, see crit. n., and cf. Del. *ad loc.* ; Driver, *Joel and Amos*, pp. 234 f. ; We., *Psalms* (appendix) ; and art. 'Music,' in *Enc. Bib.*

5. **A new song.** See introd., and cf. xl. 4, lvii. 9 (corr. text), xcvi. 1, cxliv. 9 (from *v. 2b* and *v. 3a*), cxlix. 1, Isa. xlii. 10, Judith xvi. 13, Rev. v. 9.

7-18. Yahwè's moral attributes ; his creatorship. The favourite post-

exilic themes. — *Right*, or 'upright,' 'truthful,' cf. xix. 9. So in xxv. 8, xcii. 15, Yahwè is 'upright.' — Note parallelism of 'word' and 'doing.' To will, with God, is to speak, and also to do.—Creation by a word ; cf. cxlviii. 5, Gen. i. 3 ff., Isa. xlviii. 13b ; Eccclus. xliii. 26, and the well-known Bab. parallel (see 'Creation,' § 27, *Enc. Bib.*).—10. So cxix. 64.—13. The laying-up of the waters, winds, &c., in store-chambers (cxxxv. 7, Jer. x. 13, Job xxxviii. 22, Enoch xli. 4) took place at Creation. See Karppe, *Journ. asiat.* ix. ('97), 75. 'Sea' is not a

term for the 'waters above the heavens' (Hitz.); the parallel word תְּהוֹמוֹת (plur. *excellentiæ*, like יָמִים in xxiv.

2) clearly means the earthly ocean. True, in Job xxxviii. 37, the 'pitchers of heaven' are the clouds, and the store-chambers of the winds, the snow, and the hail are, of course, celestial. But the terrestrial waters too were kept in reservoirs, and these could equally well be called 'pitchers' and 'store-chambers,' or 'treasuries.'

20. See introd.—21. Cp. Isa. xl. 8,

xlvi. 10, li. 6, lv. 8 ff.—22. Cp. Jer. xxix. 11, Isa. lv. 8 f.—23. Cf. cxliv. 15, Dt. xxxiii. 29.—24. Cf. lxxiv. 2, Dt. xxxii. 9, and see on lxxxii. 8.

25—28. Cf. xi. 4, xiv. 2, cii. 20.—29. Cf. on vii. 10.—31 and 33, 32 and 34, are parallel. The two couplets generalize from facts of recent experience. Cf. xx. 8, cxlvii. 10, Prov. xxi. 31.—35. Cf. xxxiv. 16.—37. 'Death,' *i.e.* probably 'pestilence' (Jer. xv. 2; cf. 2 S. xxiv. 3).

39. **Waits on**, חִבֵּתָה (cvi. 13).

*Critical Notes.* 2. M בְּנֵיבֶל עָשׂוֹר. G ἐν ψαλτηρίῳ δεκαχόρδῳ; 'A (Field) ἐν νάβλα δεκάδος. In M (but not G) of xcii. 4 the נֵבֶל and the עָשׂוֹר appear to be distinguished, and Ibn Ezra (comparing xxxv. 14, Jer. xi. 19) supposes an asyndeton here. Jos. (*Ant.* vii. 12, 3) says that the νάβλα has twelve φθόγγοι (cp. Gr., pp. 67 f.). But we only know עָשׂוֹר in the sense of 'ten days,' or, 'the day which completes the decad' (= the tenth day). Read certainly וְשֵׁפֶר בְּנֵיבֶל; cf. cl. 3, and see on xcii. 4, cxliv. 9.

13. M כָּנֶס (Isa. xxviii. 20). Miswritten under the influence of כָּנַר. Read certainly חֶסֶן (the usual parallel to אָצֵר).—M כְּנֵד מִי (Ex. xv. 8; cf. lxxviii. 13). But parallelism and context are against this. All Vss. except E' (which agrees with M), presuppose כְּנֵאֵד, 'after the manner of a wine-skin'; so Houb., Ew., Ol., Dy., Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Bā., Kau., Duhm, We. (*Skizzen*, vi.). This, however, is a strange expression. A comparison of Job xxxviii. 37 suggests the true reading כְּנֵדְמִי = בְּנֵלְמִי = בְּנֵבֶלִים; the initial ב fell out. This suits the parallelism. See note above.

29. M הִיצֵר יָחַד. הִיצֵר is difficult. Is it to be taken with לָבָם, as if 'the hearts of them all,' or with הִיצֵר, 'who alone formed' (Duhm, cf. Ezr. iv. 3)? Parallelism is opposed to both views. Read הִידֵעַ יָחַד. הִידֵעַ became יָדַע, after which יָד easily fell out. כ, as often, became ה; ת became ד; transposition followed.

31. M הַמֶּלֶךְ. Omit the article (cf. G). [So Duhm.]

40. M עֲזִרְנוּ. More probably צִירְנוּ see on lxxviii. 7 f., and esp. lxxviii. 35.

## PSALM XXXIV.

**A**N alphabetic psalm in eleven quatrains of trimeters. The earliest editor probably considered it to be the twin-psalm to Ps. xxxv., for the original title which we seem to discern underneath the absurd title relative to an occasion in the

life of David represents Ps. xxxiv. as commemorating the flight of hostile Jerahmeelites and Geshurites. These foes are expressly mentioned in Ps. xxxv., where the danger caused by them is vividly described. The reference in xxxiv. 8 to the 'angel of Yahwè' who 'encamped' (in the past) around faithful Israelites might in fact naturally be connected with a similar reference in the prayer in xxxv. 5, 6. It is only Part i., however, which has the character of a hymn of praise; Part ii. is more like a sermon. After *v.* 11 (close of Part i.) G plausibly gives a *διόψαλμα* (see crit. n. on *l.* 20). As in Ps. xxv., the 7 couplet is wanting, and there is a supernumerary 5 couplet, which, however, is wanted to complete the last quatrain.<sup>1</sup>

The speaker in *l.* 11 (cp. xxv. 16b) calls himself a 'sufferer' (עֲנִי) who cried to God on a special occasion and was answered. The view (*OP*, 248; so too Ol., Now.) that 'each pious Israelite' is meant here fails to do justice to the nationalistic character of the psalm. The 'sufferer' is, not indeed Israel simply, but the inner circle of the pious (see on xxii. 26), which alone thoroughly deserved the name of Israel, and which had among its chief functions to pray for Israel as a whole, and to lift up the standard of those who were behindhand in religious attainments. They cry as one man to Israel's God, and He delivers the whole community (which is no doubt relatively righteous) in answer to their prayers (*ll.* 7 f., 33 f.). Then the community, in its wider sense, realizes Yahwè's loving-kindness, ceases to blush at its 'desertion' by its God (*l.* 10), and joins in the grateful songs of the association of the עֲנִי ('suffering ones').

The association referred to contained, not only ordinary prayerful and obedient Israelites, but psalmists, wise men, and prophetic writers. The author of Ps. xxxiv. is at once psalmist and wise man; hence he addresses his readers in the affectionate style of the wise men towards their disciples (Prov. i. 8, ii. 1, iii. 1, &c.). This helps to account for the emphasis laid on the reality of earthly retribution.

The whole poem is as markedly post-exilic as Ps. xxv., to which it has so strong an affinity. In this connexion we may note the changed meaning of מלאך יהוה (*ll.* 8, 9), which originally meant the personal revelation of Yahwè, but here (as in xxxv. 5 f.) most probably means the protective angel of the community, Mal'chi's מלאך הברית; cp. Zech. iii. 1 ff., and Nowack's note. With respect to Lagarde's theory as to the name of the author, see introd. to Ps. xxv. Cp. a 'Note on Pss. xxxiv. and xxv.' by E. G. Hirsch in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, April, 1902, which came out too late to be considered in the critical notes.

*Of 'Arab-ethan. When the hosts of those of Jerahmeel and of Geshur fled.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| I will bless Yahwè at all times ;                 | 1 |
| Be his praise continually in my mouth !           | 2 |
| Of Yahwè let my soul make her boast ;             | 3 |
| The sufferers will hear and rejoice.              |   |
| With me magnify Yahwè ;                           | 4 |
| Together let us exalt his name.                   |   |
| Zealously I approached Yahwè, and he answered me, | 5 |
| And rescued me out of all that I dreaded.         |   |

<sup>1</sup> K. J. Grimm, *Liturg. App.* 8 ff., after a consideration of most other theories, comes to the conclusion that *v.* 23 is a later addition, designed to provide the psalm with an auspicious close. I would rather say that the original poet had this design in framing the couplet, for I take the stanzas to be each of four, not of two lines.



- Look unto him and ye will be cheered, 6
- 10 Ye cannot be put to the blush.  
There is a sufferer who cried, and He <sup>1</sup> heard, 7  
And delivered him out of all his distresses.
- The angel of Yahwè encamped 8  
Round about those who feared him and rescued them.  
Taste ye and see that Yahwè is good ; 9  
Happy the man that takes refuge in him.
- Fear Yahwè, O ye who seek him, 10  
For those who fear him suffer no lack.  
Those that deny come to poverty and are famished, \* 11
- 20 But those that zealously approach him cannot lack any  
good thing.
- Come +my+ sons, hearken to me, 12  
The fear of Yahwè let me teach you.  
Is there any one that desires life— 13  
That covets days of enjoyment of happiness ?
- Guard thy tongue from evil, 14  
And thy lips from speaking guile.  
Shun evil and do good, 15  
Seek peace and pursue it.
- Yahwè's eyes are toward the righteous, 16
- 30 And his ears toward their call for help.  
Yahwè's face is against evil-doers, 17  
To cut off their name from the earth.
- The righteous cry, and he hearkens, 18  
And rescues them out of all their distresses.  
Near is Yahwè to the broken-hearted ; 19  
He delivers those who are crushed in spirit.
- Many are the misfortunes of the righteous, 20  
But from them all Yahwè rescues him.  
All his bones Yahwè guards, 21
- 40 Not one of them is broken.
- The expectation of the wicked shall perish ; 22  
The haters of the righteous shall be brought to ruin.  
Yahwè sets free the soul of his servants ; 23  
None shall come to ruin that takes refuge in him.

2. Israel's primary duty is praise ; cf. xxxiii. 1 (יִשְׂרָאֵל = Israel).

4 f. **The sufferers**, or, 'the humble.' But see on ix. 13b. Are these עֲנִיִּים the individuals of whom זֶה עֲנִי (l. 11) consists? Or the members of the 'congregation' in the wider sense, *i.e.* all who frequent the temple and, with more or less strictness, recognize the obligations of 'righteousness'? The latter view is preferable (see introd.).—נִדְּלָהּ with ל ; not so, lxix. 13 (accus.).

11. נִדְּלָהּ, as Isa. lxxv. 5. — זֶה is demonstrative. The 'sufferer' is not even primarily (Ol., Beer) the psalmist as an individual, εὐτελής ὄντα με καὶ προβατέα (Theodoret), but the inner circle of the pious, which has the position of a teacher towards Israel at large. See introd., and *Jew. Rel. Life*, p. 125.

13, 15. The protecting angel (מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה) means here no more than this) has a host at his command, with which lately he *encamped* about Israel. טָעַם = 'perceive,' as Prov. xxxi. 18.

17. The benefits of the 'fear of Yahwè' (*i.e.* religion) are attractively set forth, as in Proverbs. Those who take part in the cultus are here bidden to 'fear Yahwè,' *i.e.* to cherish such an

awe of God as influences the conduct, on utilitarian grounds. It is not enough to 'seek Yahwè' formally (cf. l. 16-20); those who are 'strong' or 'rich' (G) shall 'hardly enter the kingdom of God'; the gate is too strait for them. To be 'strong,' it would seem, is equivalent to being an oppressor. He who would seek Yahwè must 'shun evil and do good,' must 'seek peace (*i.e.* the welfare of the pious community) and pursue it,' as zealously as if it were his individual gain. Thus דָּרַשׁ (בָּקַשׁ=) comes to mean, in l. 20, 'to approach Yahwè in a spirit of holy fear.'

29-32. Many critics transpose the ע and the פ stanzas, in order to provide a suitable subject for צַעֲקוּ, 'they cry,' in l. 33, where, as M's text stands, 'evil-doers' ought to be (and yet cannot be) the subject. Such a transposition is possible, on the analogy of Lam. ii-iv. and the alphabetic poem in Prov. xxxi. (G). But there is no such transposition in the parallel 25th psalm, and it is more natural that God's favour for the righteous should be mentioned before his disfavour for the wicked. See crit. n.

29 f. Cp. xxxiii. 18a, xviii. 6b.—

32. זִכְרָם, 'their name,' cp. ix. 7,

35 f. Cp. li. 19, and especially Isa. lvii. 15.—41. See cxii. 10b. The 'expectation' is the destruction of the righteous.

**Critical Notes.** Title. Critics have wondered at the 'substitution' of 'Abimelech' for 'Achish.' Surely we have found the key to the riddle. The titles which now refer to David, originally referred to something suggested by the contents of the psalm. The earliest editor considered Psalm xxxiv. to refer to some flight of the N. Arabian foes of the Jews. A corrupt form of the title was afterwards rewritten.

9. Read הַבִּישׁוּ וַיִּנְהָרוּ, פָּנִיכֶם (G 'A S J), with Ew., Hu., Bā., Du., &c., on account of אֵל in l. 10. ['A is presumed for פָּנִיכֶם.]

11. M וַיְהוּה שָׁמַע. Metre requires וַיִּשְׁמַע (cf. on l. 33).

13. M הִנֵּה, a participle, which acc. to Kön. (*Synt.*, § 149) the preceding virtual perfect (l. 12) shows to be a historical present. It is simpler to read חָזָה.

17. M קָדְשִׁי אֵל. In Eccus. xlii. 17 we have קָדְשִׁי אֵל (used of

pious Jews), and in Dt. vii. 6, עַם קָדוֹשׁ (cp. Ex. xix. 6, &c.). But the phrase is still peculiar; קָדָשִׁים in xvi. 3 is also very doubtful. Read probably בְּקִשְׁיוֹ [מ].

19 f. מִכַּבִּירִים. What a strange antithesis to 'those who are zealous for Yahwè'! Street in 1790 proposed כַּבִּירִים; so too independently the present writer and Winckler (*AOF*, ii. 246). This correction is plausible in lviii. 7; possibly too we should read כַּבִּיר in Ezek. xxxii. 2. In our passage one MS. (Kenn.) has 'perhaps' כַּבִּירִים. But the parallelism justifies us in preferring Duhm's correction, כַּפָּרִים, the participle of an Aramaizing verb found in the Talmud (*e.g.* *B. Bath.*, 16b, in the sense of 'denying religion.' Cp. on xvii. 13; xxxv. 17; lviii. 7. —G inserts *διαψαλμα* after v. 11.

33. Prefix צַדִּיקִים (Street, after G). Probably this was mistaken for a dittographed זָכָרִים.

41 f. M תְּמוֹתֶיךָ רָשָׁע רָעָה, a strange expression. G S T pre-suppose תְּמוֹתֶיךָ. Herz, תְּמוֹתֶיךָ רָשָׁע רָעָה, hardly || to next line. Read תְּמוֹתֶיךָ רָשָׁעִים מֵאָרֶץ (cp. on xxv. 21). Read יִשְׁמוּ (see crit. n. on Ps. v. 11).

## PSALM XXXV.

**PENTAMETERS.** A prayer against the speaker's enemies (see on *l. i f.*), together a description of their cruel behaviour, and of the speaker's self-humiliation before his God. See on title of Ps. xxxiv. Again the question arises, is the speaker an individual or the inner circle of the Jewish community personified? Not a few have taken the former view. Thus Grätz describes our psalm as 'the complaint and prayer of a singer who was much respected and had a party of adherents (*v.* 27), occasioned by a false accusation brought against him'; and Duhm as 'the complaint of one of the "quiet in the land" who is maliciously persecuted by treacherous friends, together with a prayer for help.' But the individualizing expressions in *v.* 11–17 are not stronger than those in Ps. xxii.<sup>1</sup>, and the text which is brought out by the application of criticism is really very well adapted to be explained of the community, *i.e.* it describes the religious practices by which the afflicted Jews sought to propitiate their God, and the contempt with which 'men of Belial' watched their conduct. The phraseology is that which we find elsewhere in passages which refer to the community. For instance, cp. *v.* 1 (רִיב) with xliii. 1, Jer. *l.* 34; *v.* 12 with xxxviii. 21; *vs.* 14 f. with xxxviii. 7, 18; *v.* 13 with lxix. 11 f.; *v.* 17 with xxii. 21; *v.* 18 with xxii. 23, 26, xl. 10 f.; *vs.* 21, 25 with xl. 16, Lam. ii. 16. Note also מִלֵּאדֵי יְהוָה, *v.* 5, which also occurs in xxxiv. 8, for the angel who protects the community.

The points of contact with the Book of Jeremiah which have led some, with Theodore of Mopsuestia, to explain our psalm as referring to Jeremiah, are only fresh evidence of the interest aroused by the book which bears his name. (Cp. for instance *v.* 1 with Jer. xviii. 19 (רִיב), *v.* 12 with Jer. xviii. 20, *v.* 15 with Jer. xx. 10.) The psalmist is too imitative to be Jeremiah himself. Cp. Rahlfs, עֲנִי und עָנָה in den Psalmen, 45 f., 50 f.

The date of the psalm is in fact shown to be late by its imitativeness. We may perhaps draw a subsidiary argument from the loan-word סִכָּר (see on *l.* 3).

At any rate, the synonymous loan-word **תַּתְּחַ (תַּתְּחַ)** is only found in the late Book of Job (xli. 21). The ideas are characteristically post-exilic (see *e.g.* on ll. 5, 10, 11, 14, 15). In *OP* 232, which is followed by Beer (*Ind. u. Gem. Psalmen*, p. lxviii.), the time of Nehemiah is suggested as the date. Ol., however, prefers the Syrian period. He admits that there is no definite reference to non-Israelitish foes, but further criticism reverses this judgment.

The text is in parts singularly corrupt; from one of the most corrupt passages (v. 11) Duhm infers that the poet had been accused of malversation of money; cp. on Ps. lxix. There are also a number of interpolations, the removal of which considerably improves the text.

*Of 'Arab-ethan.*

1

1 Preserve me, O Yahwè ! from the Arabians, | [from] the  
host of Jerahmeel.

Grasp the shield and the buckler, | and stand up as mine ally. 2

Draw forth spear and javelin | to confront my pursuers ; 3

Say to me, [O Yahwè,] | I am thy deliverance.<sup>1</sup>

Be they like chaff before the wind, | and let Yahwè's  
angel pursue them ! 5

Be their way in darkness, | and let Yahwè's terrors drive  
them ! 6

For without cause they have hid for me a net, | they have  
dugged a pit ;<sup>2</sup> 7

Let a pitfall take him unawares, | and in his own net<sup>3</sup> let  
him be caught !<sup>4</sup> 8

But my soul will exult in Yahwè, | will be joyous at his act  
of deliverance ; 9

10 My +whole+ frame will say, | 'O Yahwè, +how+ peerless  
thou art !' 10

[Yahwè] rescues the sufferer | from him that overmatches  
him ;

He delivers \* \* \* | and the needy from him that robs him.

Arabia and Cush vent their rage upon me, | the Ish-  
maelites plunder me ; 11

The Rehobothites requite me with evil, | they bring calamity  
upon me. 12

So for my clothing I took sackcloth, | my soul I humbled ;<sup>5</sup> 13

With prayers unto [thee, O Yahwè !] | the roof of my  
mouth became dry.

<sup>1</sup> Abashed and dishonoured be those that seek my life, 4  
Let them retreat with shame that plot to harm me.

<sup>2</sup> Without cause, for my soul.

<sup>3</sup> Which he hid.

<sup>4</sup> In the pitfall ; let him fall into it.

<sup>5</sup> With fasting.

Like bulrushes by the river's bank, | so did I bend the head ; 14  
Like reeds by the streams, | bowed down I went along.

But at my wound my haters rejoice, | they gather together  
against me ; 15

20 Those of Jerahmeel surround me, | they cry, We have  
swallowed him up.

At my supplications they deride [me], | they pour  
outscorning (?) ; 16

They gnash their teeth upon me<sup>1</sup> | like a ravening lion. 17

Draw back my soul from the wicked, | my life from those  
that deny ! 1

Let not Arabia and Cush rejoice against me,<sup>3</sup> | Ishmael  
[and] Amalek ! 19

For it is not of peace that they speak | concerning the suf-  
ferers in the land. 20

Like young lions they gnash their teeth, | and open their  
mouths wide ; 21

They say, Aha ! aha ! | see ! we have caught him.

Thou beholdest it, O Yahwè ! be not still ; | be not far  
from me ! 22

30 Rouse thee for my controversy, O my God,<sup>4</sup> | awake, for my  
cause ! 23

Do me justice, according to thy righteousness, O<sup>5</sup> my God, |  
and let them not rejoice over me ! 24

Let them not say, Aha ! we have caught him ! | [Aha !] we  
have swallowed him up ! 25

<sup>6</sup>Clothed with disgrace and infamy | be those that jeer  
at me ! . 26b

Let those sing aloud [together] for joy | that wish  
well to my righteous cause ! <sup>7</sup> 27a

<sup>1</sup> O Lord.

<sup>2</sup> I will give thanks to thee in the great congregation ; 18  
I will praise thee among a large concourse.

<sup>3</sup> My causeless opponents. <sup>4</sup> And my Lord. <sup>5</sup> Yahwè.

<sup>6</sup> Abashed and put to shame together be those that joy at my harm. 26a

<sup>7</sup> Let them be ever saying, Great is Yahwè, who delights in the welfare of  
his servant. 27b

And my tongue will utter thy righteousness, in the great assembly thy  
renown. 28

1 f. The foes of the speaker are led, as usual, by foreigners (cp. *l.* 25). That their hostility takes the form of warlike operations, is not certain. They appear to prefer fraud to open assault, presumably because of a central authority, which, though it is weak or dilatory, they cannot venture to stir up. The psalmist himself knows but little of armed forces, or he would not combine the **מָגֵן** (shield) and the **צִנְהָה** (buckler).

—4. *To me*, lit. 'to my soul,' *i.e.* to mine innermost self.

5. **Yahwe's angel** is the leader of a host (cp. on xxxiv. 8). Swift is the wind, but swifter are the heavenly beings. It is an anticipation of the great judgment (i. 4; cp. Isa. xvii. 13), the hope of which pervades the later literature.

6. **Be their way**, &c. Darkness is an added horror; cp. **פֶּחַד לַיְלָה**, xci. 5 (doubtful); Jer. xxiii. 12. Their fate shall be to them (full of) terrors (**בְּלִהוּת**); they shall be thrust out into the gloom, and fall therein. See crit. n.

7. **A pit**, **שִׁחַת**, such as wild beasts are caught in. For the idea, cp. vii. 16 f., ix. 16.

10. **My + whole + frame**. Lit. 'my bones' Cp. vi. 3 (note), li. 10.—+*How* + *peerless*, &c. Lit. 'who is like thee,' viz. among the superhuman, divine beings (see on lxxxvi. 8, and cp. lxxi. 19, lxxxix. 9, also Ex. xv. 11, and perhaps the names Micaiah, Michael).

11. **The sufferer**. A characteristically post-exilic term for Israel. Cp. lxviii. 5-7, cxlvi. 5-9.

12 f. **From him that robs him**,

The rich man has increased his wealth by despoiling the poor. Cp. lxii. 11, Isa. lxi. 8, iii. 14.—*Arabia and Cush*. Practically synonymous (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Cush,' § 2).

14. **My good . . with evil**. Cp. xxxviii. 21, cix. 5. The pious had fulfilled the duty of brotherly love

(**חֶסֶד**) to all fellow-Jews, but their opponents of Jewish race had treated them far otherwise. A split in the Jewish community is presupposed, such as we know to have existed during the time of the struggle of strict Judaism for victory.—*Brought calamity upon me*. Calamity is expressed by the figure of stumbling. The received text is impossible; 'childlessness' (see crit. n.) was certainly not the fate of the pious community.

15-18. Sackcloth for clothing, fasting (note the gloss), prayers and litanies, these were the rites and customs by which the speaker sought to propitiate Yahwe. Cp. lxix. // 23-26. Observe that it was for himself, not for his enemies (an aimless and unparalleled form of charity) that the pious community fasted and prayed. Cp. 'the sackcloth of my petition' (Baruch iv. 20) and note that **עָנָה נַפְשִׁי** is a phrase characteristic of the Levitical law (see e.g. Lev. xvi. 20, 21) : cp. Isa. lviii. 5 **יָבֵשׁ חֲבִי**; xxii. 16 (lxix. 4). *Like bulrushes*, *i.e.* with a movement backwards and forwards. Cp. Isa. lviii. 5, 'To droop one's head like a bulrush, and to make sackcloth and ashes one's couch,—wilt thou call this a fast, and a day acceptable to Yahwe?' See crit. n.

19 f. **At my wound**, **לְפִצְעֵי**; a figure for a national calamity, Isa. i. 6. Cp. *l.* 22; xxxviii. 11.—*We have swallowed him up*, as Lam. ii. 16.

21 f. See *Jewish Religious Life*, 119. The supplications are those referred to in *l.* 16. For *pour out scorning*, cp. Job xxxiv. 7. *Grash their teeth*, a sign of rage; so *v.* 21; cp. Lam. ii. 16, Job xvi. 9. **טָרַף** as xxii. 14.

23, 27. **The young lions**, **כִּפְרִים**, as xvii. 12, xxii. 21 (corr. text), lviii. 7.

25. **קָרַץ עֵין**, as Prov. vi. 13, x. 10, cp. xvi. 30. But see crit. n.

*Critical Notes.* 1. **M רִיבָה יְהוָה אֶת־יְרִיבִי** (preceded by **פָּסַק**). **רִיב** also in Jer. xviii. 19, Isa. xlix. 25, where G supposes **רִיבָה יְרִיבִי**. On the a nalogy of xliii. 1, lxxiv. 22, read **שְׁמַרְנִי יְהוָה מֵעֲרֵבִים**.—**M אֶת־**

לִחְמִי. לחם is not used in Kal. (see on lvi. 2 f.). Read probably מִמֶּחְנֶה; ירחמאל; the intermediate reading was perhaps מִמֶּלְחָמָה.

3. מִסָּנֶר. The vss. all regard this as an imperative, and since 'shut to meet' &c. is impossible, Schwally (*ZATW* '91, 258) proposed חֲנֶר, Halévy (*Rev. sem.* iii. 47) עִירָה. Neither of these, however, is suitable. We expect the name of a weapon, not indeed the Scythian and Persian *σάγαρις* (Kenn., Ew., Hu., Bi., We., Du., &c.; see Herod. i. 214, and Sayce *ad loc.*; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 4 &c.), but rather some Babylonian weapon. The *tartahu* (a light javelin) is mentioned in Job xli. 21 (read תרתח), and probably in Ps. xlv. 4, lv. 22; we may here, with reasonable probability, read שָׁנֶר, and find in it the Ass. *šukūdu*, a synonym of *tartahu*. See Delitzsch, *Assyr. HWB*, p. 656a.

4. Insert יהוה; 'fell out after נפשי.—Omit v. 4 as a quotation from xl. 15 (Du.).

5 f. The text is in some disorder. Hu., Bi., Bā. are content with transposing דָּחָה (דָּחַם, Houb., Ol., &c.; G ἐκθλίβων αὐτούς) and רָדַפּם; ידחו in fact occurs in Jer. xxiii. 12, which is || to l. 6. This view has been put in its most plausible form by Rahlfs, עני und ענו in den *Psalmen*, 44, and makes a possible text, but is nevertheless wrong. The unfortunates who are walking in dark ravines need no 'angel of Yahwè' to push them; unless an 'angel of Yahwè' bear them in his hands, they will certainly 'dash their feet against a stone,' and wound themselves. Nor, even apart from this, is the repetition of יהוה מלאך at all probable. Rahlfs has also not investigated חֲלָקוֹת. This word only appears elsewhere in Jer. xxiii. 12, where it occurs in the same singular combination with 'darkness,' and in Dan. xi. 21, 34, where (like חֲלָקוֹת, v. 32) it seems to mean 'treachery' (cp. חֲלָקָה, 'flattery,' Prov. vi. 24). If the word is rightly read in Ps. xxxv. 6 and Jer. xxiii. 12, it should mean there, not 'treachery,' but 'terrible,' 'distressful' (cp. Isa. viii. 22). But these duplicated forms are open to suspicion; ירַקֶּק in lxviii. 14, עקלקלות in cxxv. 5, and perhaps Judg. v. 6, are corrupt. In lxxiii. 18 the unsuitable חֲלָקוֹת has, by the present writer, long since been corrected into בִּלְהוֹת; can we be wrong in correcting חלקלקות here and in Jer. l.c. into בִּלְהוֹת, and ח' into בִּלְהוֹת? דָּחָה should not im- probably be יִדְבִּיקֶם (l. 5b), and l. 6b should be תִּדְבִּיקֶם.

7. Transpose שחת and רשתם, or rather רשת (Bi.) with S, Houb., Hu., Bā., &c. In b omit חנם and נפשי (metre).

8. For תאחזהו שוּחָה (against parallelism) read תאחזהו שוּחָה, and for וברשתו תלכדו read וברשתו ילכד. ת in תלכדו comes

from ב, the ב in וברשתו; the final ן from י. Transposition.—For בשואה read בשוחה; like יפל־בה, it is a gloss.

11 f. Prefix יהוה (Du.).—ועני may be a corrupt fragment of משיע (י = מ; ן = נ). Something has fallen out.

13. M עדי חָמָס, suspicious. Du. emends שָׁקָר עדי; cp. xxvii. 12. But xxvii. 12 is corrupt, and in both passages we should most probably read ערב וכוש. For יקומו read יקמוני (xxvii. 12).—M אֲשֶׁר לֹא־דַעְתִּי יִשְׁאַלֻנִי. But the witnesses (?) surely did not come forward to 'ask' things of the defendant, and still less 'things that he knew not.' The sense usually given is very inappropriate. The mention of 'robbing' in l. 12 suggests יִשְׁלֹנִי (cp. on lviii. 8). אֲשֶׁר לֹא־דַעְתִּי comes probably from יִשְׁמַעְאֲלִים.

14. M תחת טובה, most obscure. Read רַחֲבֹתַיִם.—M שָׁכֹל לְנַפְשִׁי. But can 'bereavement (comes) to my soul' be equivalent to 'I was forsaken by all friends'? Can שָׁכֹל even mean 'bereavement'? Bā. renders 'childlessness (G ἀτεκνία) was my lot.' But this does not at all suit. T alone is correct; בשול = מתקל, which Gr. actually reads. But נַתַּנִּי כְשֹׁל לִנִּי is metrically too long. Read הִכְשִׁילֹנִי נַפְשִׁי (obs. that ה precedes). The next word ואני has after it Pasek, which indicates that the preceding words were imperfectly written in the MS.

15. M G ואני. Read וְאַתָּנָה; see lxix. 12, where the context shows that the trouble referred to was suffered by the pious Jewish community and not by its opponents. If, therefore, any one's "sickness" is referred to, it must be that of Israel, and we have to correct בחלותי. The present context, however, shows that the speaker at the time spoken of was able to move about. This leads us to suspect that the word may be intrusive; metrically indeed it is quite superfluous. G found even בחלותם troublesome; it gives ἐν τῷ αὐτοὺς παρενοχλεῖν μοι. But how shall we account for the assumed presence of בחלותי in the pre-Septuagint text? It undoubtedly arose out of a dittographed ותפלתִי; observe that נפשׁ precedes ותפלתִי, and that the same word in M is only separated from בחלותם by ואני, which, as the Pasek inclines us to suppose, was written indistinctly (it is a fragment of ואתנה). Another intrusive word is בְּצִוִּים, of which metre proves the superfluity. Plainly it is a gloss.

16. M ותפלתִי עלי־חֵיקִי תשוב. This is not enough for a line, and does not make sense. Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Now. correct תִּשָּׁב לִי, 'thou wilt requite to me,' and Bi. appends יהוה. But this implies an incorrect view of the context, and in any case does not produce a parallelism. Herz



would read, **בְּתַפְלוֹת אֵלֶיךָ יְיָשׁ**. **וּתְפַלְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם חֲבִי תִיבֵשׁ**. Better **בְּתַפְלוֹת אֵלֶיךָ יְיָשׁ**. **חֲבִי** (cf. xxii. 16).

17. M **כָּרַע בְּאָח**; Abbott **כָּרַע** (*Hermathena*, Feb. 1891, p. 69). But the descriptions in parallel psalms do not favour the reading. Herz's ingenious correction is **כָּרַע בְּאָחוֹ**. It is some outward sign of humiliation before God which is required. But can **כָּרַע** mean 'to bow, or bend, the head'? Besides, to produce a hemistich of adequate length, something more had to be said connected with the **אָחוֹ כָּרַע** must, therefore, conceal **יָאֵר**. We must now extend our view. M continues **לִי הַתְּהַלְכָּתִי**. This cannot contain the point of comparison between the speaker and the river-reeds. **הַלְכָּתִי** must be put aside for the present; **לִי הַתְּהַלְכָּתִי** comes from **עַל־שֹׁפֶת** (Gen. xli. 3, &c.). The right verb (instead of **הַלְכָּתִי**) is **נִכְפָּתִי**; cf. Isa. lviii. 5. **כ** in M's **כָּרַע** is a fragment of **כֵּן**. Read **בְּאָחוֹ עַל־שֹׁפֶת יָאֵר כֵּן נִכְפָּוֹתִי**. Cf. lxix. 11 (corr. text).

18. M **בְּאֶבְל־אֵם**, the objective genitive (cf. **אֶבֶל עַל**, Hos. x. 5). So Kön., *Synt.*, § 336m, and most. Bā. (after 'A), however, 'as when a mother mourns.' More and more extraordinary. Is there no remedy? **ὡς πενθῶν καὶ σκυθρωπύζων**; hardly **וּכְאֶבֶל וּכְאֶמָּל**; probably a guess. Herz ingeniously **בְּלֹא חֶמָּה** (Job xxx. 28). But patience. What follows in M? **קָדַר שְׁחוּתִי**. Two mutually inconsistent symbolic verbs; elsewhere **קָדַר** goes with **הַלֵּךְ**, not with **שָׁחָה**. Hence Riehm would transpose **הַלְכָּתִי** and **שְׁחוּתִי**. The truth is that **קָדַר** represents a stray portion of the right word to correspond to **אָחוֹ**; **אֵם** which precedes represents another portion. In Sirach xl. 16, the *codex unicus* reads **נַחַל נָפֶת עַל כְּקִרְדָּמוֹת**, but **נָפֶת** should probably be **שֹׁפֶת**, and **כְּקִרְדָּמוֹת** should be **בְּקִרְדָּמוֹת**,<sup>1</sup> 'reed-stalks' (Cowley, Neubauer). The latter is a new Hebrew word (T. B., *Shabbath*, viii. 1; *Erubin*, xxii. 1). Bringing over **כ** from **כְּאֶבֶל**, we obtain from M's text **כְּאֶמָּל**; this should be **בְּקִרְדָּמוֹת**. **אֶבֶל** has still to be accounted for. This, as the parallel line shows, represents a description of the position of the reed-stalks. They grew by water—**עַל־יְבֵלֵי מַיִם**. **אֵם** which follows **אֶבֶל** in M does duty both for a portion of **קָדַר** and for **מִים**; **מִים** in short dropped out from its resemblance to **מִית**, which was originally written where **אֵם** now stands. **שְׁחוּתִי** alone remains. This is not enough for a hemistich. At last we can make use of the second part of M's **הַתְּהַלְכָּתִי** in L. 19. **שְׁחוּתִי** is a combination of parts of

<sup>1</sup> Bacher, however, defends the form with **ד** (*JQR*, 1897, p. 559).

the two words, שְׁחוֹחַ הַלִּבְתִּי (xxxviii. 7 'ה' ; Isa. lx. 14 'ש'), which is the complement of בֶּקַע עַל־יְבִלִי מִים. Observe that Ben Sira, who may allude to our passage in Sir. xl. 16, uses the phrase עַל־יְבִלִי מִים in connection with the flower called *shushan* in Sir. xlix. 8. This writer is fond of the psalms.

19. For יבצלעי read לִפְצָעֵי with Herz (cp. xxxviii. 18), and for ונאספו read שִׁנְאִי (ש' and ס confounded, י and ו ; פ' inserted). G καὶ κατ' ἐμοῦ, corrupted from καὶ εἰς τράνυματα ἐμοῦ. So Herz.

20. For M's נכים ולא ידעת (G נגעים, μίστιγες) read בְּנִי יִרְחֹמְאֵל בְּתַרְוִנִי (cp. on v. 11b). The editor did his best with fragments of the text.—For קרעו ולא דמו read קָרְאוּ בְּלַעְנוֹהוּ. Cp. l. 32 (v. 25). Lines 21 and 22, as restored, confirm one another. Ol., Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Bā., Kau. read for נכים, נכרים, but 'aliens' have no place in this context, nor can we easily, with Bertholet (*Die Stellung*, 185), illustrate נכרים by lxi. 9, where נִכְרִי is clearly equivalent to בְּנִכְרִי as if נ' could be applied to born Jews. On cxiv. 7 f., 11, see note.

21. For בְּחַנְפִי לַעֲנִי מַעוֹנִי G apparently reads בְּחַנְפִי לַעֲנִי (or לַעֲנִי ?) לַעֲנִי. Since בָּחוּ cannot mean 'to vex,' critics in general have at once rejected this, though Wellh. adopts לַעֲנִי לַעֲנִי (improbable). Herz proposes בְּחַנְפִי (from חָנַן) which is scarcely possible. We., doubtfully, מִחַרְפִּי. Read perhaps for a בְּתַחֲנִי לַעֲנִי לִי (cp. xxii. 8 f.). לִי fell out, ל being liable to confusion with כִּי (the letter which follows in M). For b I propose יַבִּיעוּ [בוּ] ; the former word corresponds to מַעוֹנִי, while בוּ fell out through its resemblance to בִּיעוּ. This, however, is only a possible and suitable conjecture.

22. Omit אֲדָנִי (v. 17), an editorial insertion, and for כְּמֹה תִּרְאֶה read כְּמֹה־אֲרִיָּה טָרֵף (xxii. 14) ; ת (= ט) may be a fragment of טָרֵף. For חָרַק read חָרַקָּה (Bi.). Cp. on xvii. 5.

23. M מִשְׁאִיָּהֶם. Ol., Dy, Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We. trace here שָׁא[נ], 'to roar.' But it is quite as easy and produces a better sense to read מִרְשָׁעֵיהֶם.—For יִהְיֶה־תִּי read יִהְיֶה־תִּי (see on xxii. 21), and for כְּפִירִים read כְּפָרִים (xxxiv. 11).

24. Verse 18 (a hexameter) in M supplies the place of a lost line.

25. The constructions לִי אִיבִי שָׁקַר and שִׁנְאִי חֲנָם are very questionable ; the theories in Kön., *Synt.*, p. 236, n. 1, are improbable. Read אֶל־יִשְׁמַחֲרֵלִי עֶרֶב וְכוּשׁ יִשְׁמַעֲאֵל [וְ]עֹמֶלֶק. Cp. on xxxviii. 20, lxi. 5. Omit שָׁקַר שִׁנְאִי, based on a dittographed עֵין.

26. Omit וְ (Bi.), and read עֲנִי (lxxvi. 10); this was miswritten ונעי; hence רנעי. The improbable word רנע was unknown to the ancient interpreters (cp. S). ננעי (Hal., *Rev. sc'm.* iii. 50 f.) is not suitable.

27. M דְּבַרִּי מְרֻמֹּת יִחְשְׁבִין. Bi. and Du. keep this, but it makes an unsuitable parallel to the next line. דְּבַרִּי too is suspicious; in the parallel instances (lxv. 4, cv. 27, cxxxvii. 3, cxlv. 5) it seems to be corrupt. Read בְּכַפֵּירִים יִחְרְקוּ שֵׁן (cp. Lam ii. 16). The elements have been ingeniously worked up, so that no single word of the corrupt reading corresponds to any single word of the Hebrew text.—Omit the superfluous עָלִי.

28. M רִאֲתָה עֵינַי. Not a natural exclamation for these ruffians. Read probably הִפְשַׁנְוּהוּ רִאֲהָ; cp. l. 32.

30 f. For הָעֵרִיה read עוֹרָה. In אֲדַנִּי (a gloss) has taken the place of הִקְצִיחָה.—Omit יְהוּה.

32. M אֶל־יֹאמְרוֹ בִּלְעֲנֻהוּ (end of v. 25) is a correction of the corrupt אֶל־יֹאמְרוֹ בִּלְבָם. For the obscure נַפְשֵׁנוּ ('our appetite?') read certainly with Houb., Lowth, Street, הִפְשַׁנְוּהוּ, a suitable || to בִּלְ. Metre requires הָאֵחָ to be supplied before בִּלְ.

33. M הַמְנִדִּילִים. Read certainly הַמְלִיעִים (see on xxxviii. 17, lv. 13).—34.—In *a* insert יִחְדּוּ (metre). The insertions in v. 26*a*, v. 27*b*, and v. 28 (noticed by Du.) come from xl. 15 (שִׁחֲדוּ for חִפְצִי, xl. 17, and lxxi. 24 respectively). כִּלְיֵהִים should be בְּקֶהֱלָ רָב; cp. on lxix. 20, lxxi. 8, 15, 24.

## PSALM XXXVI.—I.

A FRAGMENT of a psalm on the wickedness of Israel's oppressors. For its tendency, see the opening note. The text is specially corrupt, and the original meaning may have been further obscured by editorial manipulation. Still the parallel passages, x. 1-7 and xiv., enable us to correct the errors with considerable probability. Like Ps. xiv. the passage is in pentameters.

*Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.*

I

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | No judgment [of Yahwè]   for the prince of Jerahmeel,  | 2 |
|   | No God-given terror   for the leader of Edom :         |   |
|   | For Yahwè covers his eyes   from the guilt of Ishmael. | 3 |

He speaks but of harm and deceit, | he has ceased to act  
wisely :<sup>1</sup>

Harm [and sorrow] and violence | are all his devices, 4  
He persists in every bad course, | he abhors not evil. 5

1-3. The statement that there is *no judgment* for the tyrant reminds us of the complaints in lxxiii. 11 ff. (reading וְאִמָּר). The psalmist is tempted to despair of a recompence for faith. Ps. xiv. is, therefore, only parallel in part, for there it is the oppressor who says that God is inactive—practically non-existent; but here it is a psalmist of Israel who, arguing from the experience of the moment, declares that there is no judgment. There too the psalmist points forward to a sudden terror (פַּחַד) which will beset the wicked, but here no such God-given terror is expected for the princes of Edom. So too in

x. 1 the psalmist does but complain to Yahwè that He covers His eyes, but here, forgetting his privilege of 'pouring out his complaint' to his God, the speaker lays it down as a fact that Yahwè has turned away, without attempting to alter the fact by the persuasions of believing prayer. *The prince of Jerahmeel* (cp. lxxviii. 22, cx. 6) is a personification of his people; cp. Isa. x. 12 ff. In lii. 3, 'Jerahmeel' is again personified; cp. also xiv. 1.

4-6. Cp. x. 4, 7.—לְהַשְׁכִּיל.

Cp. xiv. 2, יִתְצַב.—הִישׁ מוֹשְׁכִיל.

Cp. i. 1, עָמַד.

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. M נאם-פֶּשַׁע, 'an oracle of rebellion'? But though נאם might, irregularly, introduce the title of a post-exilic prophecy, it is, from an exegetical point of view, not possible here; I marvel that Duhm should not see this. נעים or נעם (Kr., Gr., Diestel) however, is too slight a correction. Parallelism suggests that the initial נא may represent אֵין; and the sense seems to require מִשְׁפָּט [יהודה] (cp. x. 5, 6).—M לְרָשָׁע בִּקְרֵב לְבִי. G S J, and two edd. of T, presuppose לְבִי, and a host of critics (Houb., Dathe, Lowth, Ew., Ol., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Kau., Beer, We.) adopt this. This expedient, however, implies that the rest of the line is altogether, or nearly, correct, which is not the case. We shall find a number of cases in which לב conceals a fragment of ירחמאל (see on lxxiii. 1, lxxvi. 6); קרב too (cp. ברכאל, Job xxxii. 2) probably represents a part of the same word. Read לְיֵשֶׁר יִרְחַמְאֵלִים (cp. lxxviii. 22, cx. 6).—M לִנְגִיד עֵינָיו. Weak. Read probably לִנְגִיד אָדָם; כו = ני.

3. M בִּיהַחֲלִיק אֱלֹו בְּעֵינָיו. Evidently corrupt; no help from the versions. What is the subject of 'הח? Can אֱלֹו mean 'with reference to Yahwè'? Palliatives are We.'s suggestion of אמריו (cp. Prov. ii. 16, vii. 5) and Buhl's of אל-רעהו (cp. Prov. xxix. 5), for אֱלֹו (we might add אל-יהודה, cp. cxlv. 12, lxxvii. 3). But בעיניו is also suspicious, and the whole line has to be brought into fuller accordance

<sup>1</sup> To act well.

with lines 1 and 2. Remembering x. 16 we can hardly help reading, עֵינֵי [יהוה] אֱלֹהִים. An imperfect ק might be misread as ם, and the corruptions of אֱלֹהִים in the Psalms are numerous.—M לִמְצָא עֵינֵי לְשֹׁנָא. The first word or the third is clearly superfluous, and neither word suits the context. We's לִמְד is too remote; Herz's לִאֲמִץ would require לְבו. Both לִמְצָא and לְשֹׁנָא appear to represent an ethnic, and that ethnic is יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים (cp. on לְשׁוֹנָם, lxiv. 9). Read מֵעַן יִשׁ.

5. Sense and metre require בְּלִמְחָשְׁבָתִי וְחָמָס [וְעִמָּל] אָזֶן ; note Pasek. Cp. lvi. 6.

6. Read בְּכָל־דֶּרֶךְ (G), with Herz, who also suggests בָּרַע (B precedes).

### PSALM XXXVI.—2.

**TRIMETERS.** A fragment of a meditation on Yahwè's lovingkindness and righteousness from which none are excluded (for God is the gracious Lord of the whole world), but which is specially to be felt in the temple. There faithful Jews can almost forget their perilous position; they are like guests at a rich banquet. But ere they depart, they pray for deliverance from their wicked oppressors, or, in other words, that lovingkindness and righteousness may still be displayed towards Israel. It is a mistake to suppose v. 13 has come from another context. In the true text the connexion is unbroken. Note the allusion to P in v. 7 (l. 4). Ps. lxi. (corrected text) is parallel. This psalm supplements xxxvi.<sup>(1)</sup>; see l. 5.

- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 1  | Thy lovingkindness is as high as the heavens,           | 6  |
|    | And thy faithfulness as the skies.                      |    |
|    | Thy righteousness is like mount Jerahmeel,              | 7  |
|    | Thy justice is like the great abyss.                    |    |
|    | Edom and Rehoboth thou wilt subdue ;                    |    |
|    | How precious is thy lovingkindness, O Yahwè !           | 8  |
|    | The sufferers of thy people sing for joy,               |    |
|    | Under the shadow of thy wings they find refuge ;        |    |
|    | They feast on the richness of thy house,                | 9  |
| 10 | With the stream of thy delicacies thou refreshest them. |    |
|    | For beside thee is the fountain of life,                | 10 |
|    | By thy light we see light.                              |    |
|    | Preserve thy lovingkindness for those that know thee,   | 11 |
|    | And thy righteousness for the upright in heart.         |    |
|    | Let not the foot of pride tread upon me,                | 12 |
|    | Nor the hand of the wicked put me to flight ;           |    |
|    | Let the workers of harm fall,                           | 13 |
| 18 | Let them be thrust down, and not be able to rise.       |    |

I ff. So lvii. 11, ciii. 11.—*Mount Zerahmeel*, i.e. the mountains of the Negeb. See crit. n. The received text, however, has 'God's mountains,' a fine phrase, though unsuitable in an address to Yahwè. Cp. xc. 2, Prov. viii. 25, Job xv. 7, Mic. vi. 2, Hab. iii. 6. The Elohim themselves dwelt on a mountain (Ezek. xxviii. 14, cp. Isa. xiv. 13), and mountain-tops were specially sacred, like the stars (Isa. xiv. 13) and the cedar-trees (lxxx. 11, civ. 16).—*Thy justice*. The traditional reading 'thy judgments' is obscure; it might mean either 'thy punishments' or 'thy decisions' (see crit. n.) How is God's justice like the *great abyss* (Gen. vii. 11, P)? Because it is unsearchable (Rom. xi. 33, where 'thy judgments,' plural, occurs; cp. Job xi. 9, 'deeper than Sheol,' of the divine wisdom)? Rather because the 'great abyss' is the source of all the regular, beneficent waters of the earth. Thus solidity and fulness are the two qualities predicated of the divine righteousness. This 'righteousness' (Street, 'bounty') may be viewed as the carrying out in act of 'lovingkindness.'—*Edom and Rehoboth*, &c. An allusion to xxxvi. (1) The editorial substitute, however, is fine, 'Man and beast thou dost deliver.' **בְּהֵמָה** here means the animal world in general (Gen. iii. 14, Prov. xxx. 30, Eccles. iii. 19, 21, Ps. xlix. 13 [plur.], but lxxiii. 22 is corrupt). But a reference to a concrete deliverance is required.

7. **The sufferers of thy people.** The text-reading, 'the human race' (see crit. n.), if correct, would have to be explained on the analogy of xii. 2b, xiv. 2a, where the Jews *represent* the human race, as being the central people; lxx. 3 and || passages, which are corrupt, cannot be quoted here. But so soon after **אָדָם** 5, where **אָדָם** is used of men in general, without any implied reference to the privileged

position of Israel, this is not likely. Besides, on the analogies mentioned, the phrase **אָדָם בְּנֵי** would imply blame. See crit. n.

8. The spirit of Elohim is represented as if a great bird in Gen. i. 3; in Dt. xxxii. 11 f. Yahwè himself is likened to an eagle. Cp. xvii. 8, lvii. 2, lxi. 5, and the || passage lxiii. 7; also Ruth ii. 12.

9. See on xxiii. 5. **דָּשֵׁן**; cp. lxiii. 6, Isa. lv. 2, Jer. xxxi. 13.

10. **נַחַל**, a perennial stream (see 7. 10a), metaphorically, as Mic. vi. 7, Job xx. 17. Cp. **נֶהָר**, xlvi. 5. *Thy delicacies*, **שְׂמֹנִים**, as Isa. xxv. 6.

There is no reference to 'Eden,' as interpreters of M's text suppose.

11 f. **The fountain of life.** Cp. Jer. ii. 13, xvii. 13, Prov. xiii. 14, xiv. 27. The tree of life is not mentioned in the Psalms (but four times in Prov.). Both tree and river of life occur in Rev. xxii. 1 f. The Chaldaean legend says that Istar found it in the nether world when she returned to revive Tammuz (*Du'izzu*). *By thy light*, &c. Cp. iv. 7. Life and light are parallel; cp. Job iii. 16, 20, Ps. xlix. 20, lvi. 14. G finds the hope of immortality (*ὁψόμεθα φῶς*; cp. *P's. Sol.* iii. 16), and no doubt there is a Messianic touch in the expression. It is but a foretaste of coming bliss that can as yet be enjoyed by the pious.

16. **הַתְנַדְּנִי**. To 'wander' is a vivid term for exile or dispersion (lix. 12, Gen. iv. 12, 14, 2 K. xxi. 8), which involved for individuals the danger of beggary (cix. 10, cp. Prov. xxvii. 8) and for the community religious inanition (cp. Hos. iii. 4).

17 f. See introd. and crit. note. The *workers of harm* are primarily the N. Arabians (see the parallelism in Ps. xiv., lines 7, 8).

**Critical Notes.** 1. **יְהוָה בְּהַשְׁמִים**. Here are two difficulties. 1. The unsyncopated **ה**, and 2. the omission of the 'tertium comparationis.' The parallels for the first (2 K. vii. 12, see Klo.; Neh. ix. 19) are very doubtful. lvii. 11 might suggest that **נָדוּל** had dropped out; but **בַּה** suggests that **עַד** has been lost, and that prefixed to **עַד** was **נָבִיָּה** (cp. ciii. 11). Psalm xxxvi. (2) being a fragment, **יְהוָה** was prefixed by the early editor to clear up the sense.—3. **מִבְּהַר־רִיחָמַל**. Read **בְּהַר־רִיחָמַל**.

4-6. Read probably מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ; cp. on lxxii. 1.—Read תְּהוֹם [כַּ], with Hal.; כ precedes.—M תוֹשִׁיעַ, a supposed allusion to the deliverance of Noah and his animals. But if מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ were correct, and meant 'thy punishments' (see above), we should not expect to find deliverance referred to. Read probably אָדָם וְרַחֲבוֹת תִּכְבֹּשׁ (see xxxvi.<sup>(1)</sup>).—יְהוָה at the end of v. 7 is a (correct) variant to אֱלֹהִים in v. 8.

7. M וּבְנֵי אָדָם, spoiling the structure of the stanza. וּבְנֵי does double duty. As a whole it represents a missing verb—[י]רַנְנוּ, while בְּנֵי represents a word in regimen with אָדָם (?). בְּנֵי אָדָם, however, though retained by Du., cannot be original (see note above); עֲנֵי עַמֶּךָ is the most suitable correction. Gr. בְּנֵי אֱבִיוֹן.

9 f. Read probably יִרְוֶיךָ.—M עֲדִיךָ. עֲדָנִים only here. 2 S. i. 24, Jer. li. 34 need correction. 'Very doubtful; perhaps connected with עֲטִין, Job xxi. 24' (We.); but עֲטִין is even more doubtful. Read most probably שְׁמִיךָ (Isa. xxv. 6). See note above.

13. M מִשְׁדֵּךְ. It is usual to render 'prolong,' and to group this passage with lxxxv. 6, cix. 12, Jer. xxxi. 3, Neh. ix. 30. In lxxxv. 6 this sense is suitable, but in the other passages it produces a forced interpretation. What we require here (and similarly in cix. 12, Jer. xxxi. 3) is 'Be faithful to thy covenant of lovingkindness, so that the arrogant and the wicked may not oppress me.' It would be a poor expedient to reach the sense by invoking the aid of Arabic, and rendering מִשְׁדֵּךְ 'make firm.' Clearly we must read שְׁכַר; ש and כ were occasionally transposed, so that שִׁכָּר became מִשְׁכָּר; then ר, naturally enough, was mistaken for ד. In Neh. ix. 30, too, the text must be corrupt; the various supposed ellipses are equally intolerable. Read וַתִּחַם.

15. M תְּבוּאָתִי. Read תְּבוּסָתִי (Gr., Hal.); cp. Isa. xli. 25 (*SBOT*).

17. M יִכְלֵי, יִדְחוּ, שֵׁם נִפְלֵי, either referring to an early experience of the sudden collapse of the seeming prosperity of the wicked (Ol.), or perfects of prophetic certainty (Del., Bā., Davidson), or precative perfects (Kün., *Synt.*, § 172b). Kün. advocates the third view, as producing a connexion with v. 12. Du. suggests that v. 13 may be a remnant of the continuation of vv. 2-5; metre, however, does not favour this view. The probability is that שֵׁם is a remnant of רִשְׁעִים. The eye of the scribe may have wandered to the preceding line, in which רִשְׁעִים was rightly given. The verbs should probably be יִכְלֵי, יִדְחוּ, יִפְלֵי [cp. Kön.]. The corruption of 'ר into שֵׁם would lead to the alteration of the imperfects into perfects, perhaps with a reminiscence of שֵׁם פָּחַדוּ, xiv. 5, where, however, שֵׁם is certainly a corruption of רִשְׁעִים. The contrast between

*l.* 12 *f.* and *l.* 13 *f.* now becomes natural and striking. The psalmists constantly write, 'Let me be delivered, but let mine enemies be overthrown.'

## PSALM XXXVII.

**T**RIMETERS. An alphabetical psalm (like ix.—x.), with only a few lacunæ. The four-line stanzas possess a pleasing symmetry, and warmth and sincerity of feeling. The psalm should be read with Pss. xxxix., xlix., lxxiii., cxi. *f.* Observe (1) the respect for poverty, unknown to the hymns of the Rig Veda, and (2) the insistence on the doctrine of earthly retribution, and on the imminence of a great and final judgment. Naturally there are points of contact between this psalm and the Books of Proverbs and Job. The awful mystery of Providence is, however, more superficially treated here than in Job. Like the author of Ps. xci. the psalmist sympathizes with the first speech of Eliphaz; hence perhaps his two references to personal experience (*zz.* 25, 35 *f.*; cp. Job iv. 12 *ff.*, v. 3). Its alphabetic form, literary affinities, and didactic character alike prove it to be one of the later psalms. In three stanzas probably the Jerahmeelites are referred to by name.

On the treatment of the problem of retribution in Pss. xxxvii., xxxix., lxxiii. cp. Couard, *Th. St. u. Kz.* 1901, pp. 10 *ff.*

*Of 'Arab-ethan.*

1

- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 1  | Be not incensed at evil doers,                      |    |
|    | Nor enraged at those who practice injustice ;       |    |
|    | For they will quickly fade away like grass,         | 2  |
|    | And wither like the green herbs.                    |    |
|    | Trust in Yahwè, and take refuge in him,             | 3  |
|    | Seek lovingkindness and faithfulness ;              |    |
|    | Then wilt thou have enjoyment of Yahwè,             | 4  |
|    | And he will grant thee thy heart's petitions.       |    |
|    | Yahwè redeemeth the crushed,                        | 5  |
| 10 | Rely upon him and he will succour ;                 |    |
|    | He will make thine innocence as clear as the light, | 6  |
|    | And thy just claim as the noonday.                  |    |
|    | Wait quietly on Yahwè, and patiently expect him,    | 7  |
|    | *   *   *   *   *   *                               |    |
|    | Be not incensed at one whose course prospers,       |    |
|    | At the man who carries out +wicked+ devices.        |    |
|    | Desist from anger, forsake wrath,                   | 8  |
|    | Be not incensed at Jerahmeel ;                      |    |
|    | For evil-doers will be cut off,                     | 9  |
| 20 | The Jerahmeelites will be rooted out.               |    |
|    | Yet a little while, and the wicked will be no more, | 10 |
|    | When thou markest his place, he will be gone.       |    |
|    | The sufferers will inherit the land,                | 11 |
|    | And will enjoy an abundance of peace.               |    |



	The wicked plots against the righteous,	12
	And gnashes his teeth at him ;	
	The Lord laughs at him,	13
	For He sees his day +of woe+ coming.	
	The wicked draw the sword <sup>1</sup>	14
30	<sup>2</sup> To slay the upright in heart.	
	Their sword will pierce their own heart,	15
	And their bows will be broken.	
	Better is the little of the righteous,	16
	Than the great wealth of the wicked ;	
	For the arms of the wicked will be broken,	17
	But Yahwè upholds the righteous.	
	Yahwè regards the concerns of the blameless,	18
	And their possession will remain for ever ;	
	They will not be put to shame in the evil time,	19
40	And in the days of famine they will be satisfied.	
	For those who are blessed by him will possess the land,	22
	And those who are cursed by him will be cut off.	
	For <sup>3</sup> Yahwè's enemies will perish like locusts,	20
	All of them will be crushed like moths.	
	The wicked borrows and cannot pay back,	21
	But the righteous shows pity and gives ;	
	The steps of the righteous are guided by Yahwè ;	23
50	He tests him, and searches out his conduct ;	
	Should he fall, he will not lie prostrate, •	24
	For Yahwè upholds his hand.	
	I have been young and now am become old,	25
	And never have I seen the righteous forsaken.	
	The posterity of Cushan [will be cut off],	
	The posterity of Jerahmeel [will be rooted out].	
	Shun evil and do good,	27
	Seek peace [and pursue it],	
	For Yahwè loves justice,	28
60	And forsakes not his pious ones.	

<sup>1</sup> And bend their bow.<sup>2</sup> To lay low the suffering and the poor.<sup>3</sup> The wicked.

- Those that practice injustice will be destroyed,  
And the offspring of the wicked will be cut off.  
The righteous will possess the land, 29  
And dwell therein for ever.
- The mouth of the righteous utters wisdom, 30  
And his tongue speaks what is right.  
The law of his God is in his heart, 31  
His foot will not waver.
- The wicked watches the righteous, 32  
70 And seeks +occasion+ to slay him.  
Yahwè will not leave him in his power, 33  
Nor condemn him when he is judged.
- Hope in Yahwè, and keep his way, 34  
He will exalt thee that thou possess the land;  
\* \* \* \* \*
- When the wicked are cut off, thou shalt look on.  
I have seen a wicked man exulting, 35  
And shouting for joy at his treasure ;  
But when I passed by +again+ lo, he was gone 36  
80 When I sought him, he could not be found.
- Preserve blamelessness, attach thyself to uprightness, 37  
For there is a future for a man of peace.  
But transgressors are destroyed together, 38  
The future of the wicked is cut off.
- The deliverance of the righteous comes from Yahwè, 39  
He is their refuge in time of trouble.  
Yahwè helps them and rescues them,<sup>1</sup> 40  
He delivers them because they trust in him.

1 f. Almost a repetition of Prov. xxiv. 19; cp. also Prov. iii. 31 (תִּבְחֹר) should, of course, be תִּתְחַר, Gr.), xxiii. 17, xxiv. 1, Ps. lxxiii. 3. Here, at any rate, the 'evil-doers' are the Jerahmeelite intruders in Judæa. Cp. // 18, 20, 56, 78.—אֵל־תִּקְנָא. ק' means the glow of passionate excitement which would fain bring down fire

from heaven, and which, if unchecked, may lead to the denial of God's righteousness (see xlix. 6, 17, lxxiii. 3).

7. תִּתְעַנֵּג. So l. 24. Cp. Job xxii. 26, xxvii. 10, Isa. lviii. 14.

9. נִדְכָּה; see crit. n. on Ps. ix.-x., l. 53. The third stanza is now consecutive.

11 f. Cp. Job xi. 17, Isa. lviii. 10.

<sup>1</sup> He rescues them from the wicked.

13. דֹּם (for דָּם); cp. lxii. 2 (corr. text), 6.

18. **Who makes haste**, &c. See v. 16b, and cp. xlix. 16, lxxiii. 7 f. A distinct reference to the danger of seeking riches is indispensable in such a psalm. See crit. n.

23. **The sufferers**, i.e. 'the opposite party to the wicked,' as Joseph Mede (*Works*, 161) long ago saw. Cp. on ix. 13.—*Inherit the land*. Similarly ll. 41, 63, 74. Cp. xxv. 13, 1 Chr. xxviii. 8 (Mt. v. 5).

28. **His day**, i.e. the day on which he was to perish; cp. Job iii. 3, 'the day wherein I was to be born'; xviii. 20, 'astonished at his day (of ruin).'

29 f. For the idea, cp. vii. 15 ff., ix. 16 ff., xxxv. 8.

43 f. See crit. n.—45 f. The wicked man is so straitened that he cannot pay his debts. The good man is so prosperous that he can afford even to give to the (righteous) poor.

49 f. A quotation from Prov. xx.

24; cp. Prov. xvi. 9, xxiv. 16, Jer. x. 23.—*He tests him*. Cp. xxvi. 2.—

נָכַר is, of course, too large a term; the psalmist quotes a general statement, and then applies it to a special section of mankind.

53 f. Cp. Prov. x. 3, xiii. 25.—57 f. Quoted from xxxiv. 15.

69. צוֹפָה; cp. ix.-x., l. 53 (x. 8, (corr. text).—72. *Nor condemn him*. It is the controversy of opposed nations, in which Yahwè is the Judge (so Ol.).

77-80. See introd. The N. Arabian oppressors are accused of enriching themselves by violence, as in lii. 9, lxii. 11 (corr. text). See crit. note.

82, 84. אַחֲרֵית, rendered *ἐκγονα* by G in Prov. xxiii. 11, xxiv. 20. 'Future,' however, is probably the true meaning in the passages where it is usually rendered 'posterity.' 'The future . . . is cut off' (l. 84) is quite intelligible (so cix. 13; cp. Prov. xxiii. 18b). See Duhm's note, and Frankenberg on Prov. xxiii. 18.

*Critical Notes.* 5 f. M וַעֲשֵׂה-טוֹב (from l. 57). Read וַחֲסֵה-בּוֹ.—M שֶׁכֶן אֶרֶץ וְרֵעָה אֱמוּנָה. Del., We., Kau., Dri., 'Dwell in the land, and cherish fidelity.' Ew., Bā., 'Then wilt thou dwell in the land, and have secure pasturage.' There is a similar division among the Greek interpreters. 'A S'. καὶ νέμον πίστιν. Σ καὶ ποιμαίνον διηκεκῶς. G, καὶ κατασκήνου τῇν γῆν καὶ ποιμανθήσῃ ἐπὶ τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῆς (cf. G, v. 16), which only differs from 'A Se. in the adoption of אֱמוּנָה for אֱמוּנָה—a manifest error. In fact, 'A Se., Schultens, Ew., Bā. give an interpretation not wholly without plausibility. The adverbial use of אֱמוּנָה, 'securely,' presents no difficulty (Ges.—Kau., § 118 q), and the description of Canaan as a pasture is familiar to all (Ezek. xxxiv. 14 ff.; Mic. vii. 14). Del.'s view, on the other hand, supposes two quite dissimilar statements to be co-ordinated. Elsewhere in the psalm, 'dwelling in the land' is the happy prospect held out to the good; שֶׁכֶן-אֶרֶץ, if correct, certainly ought to be a promise here. But, however plausible, Ew.'s explanation of רֵעָה אֱמוּנָה will not bear examination. If the image of a pasture had presented itself to the writer's mind, it would have found clearer expression (אֱמוּנָה is vague) and much more elaborate treatment. There is a corruption of the text, and it can very easily be healed. Cp. xxxiv. 15b, and correct שֶׁכֶן אֶרֶץ accordingly into בִּקֵּשׁ (cp. on l. 58). Similar letters in sound or appearance were

confounded. רעה is superfluous; it has arisen out of a dittographed חסד (ס and ע, ח and ה confounded).

9 f. M עַל-יְהוָה דִּרְפֶּךָ, One might plausibly read גַּל אֶל (cp. Jer. xi. 20, xx. 12?) with G S T. But, in the light of xxii. 9, we must read גַּל יְהוָה לְגִרְפָּה. ו in ובטח is a fragment of ה.—M יַעֲשֶׂה. Read יִשְׁיַע; see on xxii. 32b.

13. M וְהִתְחַוֵּל לוֹ. The Hithpolel of חוּל occurs elsewhere only in (a) Job xv. 20, and (b) Jer. xxiii. 19. But in (a) read כְּתִהֵל with Beer, and in (b) כְּתִגְוֵל with Giesebrecht. אֶת הַתֶּחַ were correct, it should mean 'suffer pain.' Read וְהוּחַ; ה and ל were dittographed. So, too, I should read in Job xxxv. 14b (for תְּחוּל), where Beer's תִּחַל seems less probable after דוּם (M דִּין).

18. M אֶדָּ לְהָרַע, 'it tendeth only to evil-doing' (R.V., Driver). But the expression is 'very awkward' (Ol.), and it spoils the parallelism. Duhm (who renders 'only to one's own injury') compares the phrase in xv. 4c. The comparison is helpful, but only for emendation of the text. Read בִּירְחֻמָּאֵל. The letters are shifted up in M. The י dropped out; ב, ח and מ became כ, ה and ע respectively. יִרְחֹ is, in fact, often mutilated thus. Halévy, אֶזֶן לְהָרַע.

20. M וְקִי יְהוָה הִמָּה יִרְשׁוּ אֶרֶץ. Too long for a trimeter, and an undue anticipation of l. 23. 'Jerahmeelites' has once more been broken up and transformed; the proper verb was also first misread, then broken up and expanded. Read וִירְחֻמָּאֵלִים יִשְׁרְשׁוּ (cp. lii. 7).

29 f. Omit לְהַפִּיל עָנִי וְאַבְיֹן and וְדַרְכּוֹ קִשְׁתָּם (glosses). Cp. Duhm.—M יִשְׁרִי-דָרֶךְ. Read with G and 18 MSS. of Kenn. and de R., לֵב (vii. 11); Jer. combines the readings. The corruption was easy.

34. M הַמֶּוֹן; G πλοῦτον (πολύν). Read הוֹן. B D B 'abundance, wealth'; cf. Eccles. v. 9, Isa. lx. 5. Siegfried (*Prodiger*, 52) gives this sense to הַמֶּוֹן in Ezek. v. 12 (read vii. 12), but S S and B D B propose 'multitude'; 'noisy throng' seems the meaning (so Isa. v. 14). In Isa. lx. 5 הַמֶּוֹן יָם should be הַמֶּוֹן עַפְּסִים (xvii. 12). In Eccles. v. 9 הַמֶּוֹן is not a natural parallel to כֶּסֶף; it is no doubt a *lapsus calami* for הוֹן; the same correction is expedient in Ezek. xxix. 19, xxx. 4 (in interpolated clauses; see Co.), for what gain would there be in choosing a less natural expression? It is possible that in G's time הַמֶּוֹן was already supposed to mean sometimes 'riches,' but this only shows how early הוֹן and חֶמֶן were confounded by the scribes, just as פִּי became פָּנִי and (the reverse process) עֶמֶד became עוֹר. B D B, therefore, should

notice that the text is repeatedly very doubtful. Read here **הוֹן**.—M **רַבִּים**; unsuitable. The error was produced by **המוֹן**. Read **רַב** (G, We.).

37. M **יָמִי**, an error produced by **תַּמִּימִים**. Read **דַּרְכִּי** (G, Gr., We.). Cf. *l.* 9; i. 6.

41 f. The transposition of *v.* 22 was suggested by Brüll.

43 f. 'The whole verse (20) is no doubt corrupt' (Dy.). First, as to **כִּיקָר כְּרִים** (point so; cf. Kön., ii. 1, p. 240). **יָקָר** is an Aramaism (cp. Kön., ii. 1, p. 498) which occurs occasionally in late writings beginning with Jer. xx. 5, but nowhere again in Pss., except in xlix. 13, 21, where the text is corrupt. It is true, M points **כִּיקָר כְּ**, *i.e.* it takes **יָקָר** to be the constr. st. of the adj. **יָקָר**. This implies the rendering, 'like the most precious part of the (sacrificial) lambs,' *i.e.* the fat (so Kenn. takes it, *Remarks*, 191). A most unsuitable sense here. But surely the artificial phrase 'like the preciousness of the meadows' is hardly more admissible. **כְּרִים** does not mean 'meadows' (see on lxv. 14). Gr. proposes **כִּירֵק הָרִים**; cf. *ll.* 3, 4, and for **הָרִים**, cxlvii. 8. But the reference to 'smoke' in *l.* 42 conflicts with this. Hence Burgess (1879) and Wellh. propose **כִּיקָר** (Isa. x. 16), followed by **כְּרִים**, 'pastures' (Bur.) or **כְּרִים**, 'ovens' (We.). But is the sense produced natural? As soon as we have corrected *l.* 42, we shall see what the poet may have written in *l.* 41. We pass on, then, to **כָּלֹ בַעֲשֵׂן כָּלֹ**. The double **כָּלֹ** is very suspicious (cf. lxviii. 3a); for the second we should have expected **יְמִיהֶם** (cii. 4). But is **בַּעֲשֵׂן** right? Certainly **בַּ** should rather be **כַּ** (G S J, many MSS.), and in Isa. li. 6 **כַּעֲשֵׂן** is a mistake for **כַּעַשׂ**; the verb which follows should be read **נִדְבָאוּ** (see *SBOT*), and the same verb has probably been corrupted here into **כָּלֹ**. Read

Now we see how to correct **כִּיקָר כְּרִים**; this should be **כִּי יֵאָבְדוּ אֵיבֵי יָהּ** (כי יאבדו איבי יָהּ). For parallels see crit. note on xc. 9b, and cf. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Locusts' and 'Moths.' Observe that the traditional rendering of the text is unknown to G (*ἀμα τὰ δὲ ξασθηναὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ*

49. M **מַצְעֵד־נֶבֶר כֹּנְנֹ** (cf. Prov. xx. 24), against context. here does double duty. It forms part of two distinct words which stood together, viz. **צָרִיק** and **מַצְ**. **ק** in the latter word is represented by **נ** in **נֶבֶר**. **כֹּנְנֹ** should be **יִבְחֲנֵנִי**, which belongs to *l.* 50.—M **וְדַרְכֹּ** **יִחְפֹּץ**, a relative clause with **אֲשֶׁר** omitted (Bä.)? This seems to be against metre and parallelism. Perles, 'his way he makes straight,' com-

paring Job xl. 17 (?). Should we not read **וְדַרְכּוֹ יִחְפֹּשׂ** (Lam. iii. 40), with Herz?

55 f. The words **וּוִירְעוּ מִבְּקֵשׁ-לֶחֶם** make a fifth line to the stanza. Duhm supposes it to have been misplaced; he puts it between *v.* 20*a* and 20*b*. He has also a very plausible suggestion for *v.* 26*b*, which, emending **וִירְעוּ**, he reads **וְזָכְרוּ לְבִרְכָּה** (rather short for a trimeter). He makes no objection to *v.* 26*a*, which describes the righteous man as constantly 'showing pity and lending,' though in *v.* 21 he is described as 'showing pity and *giving*,' and though after *v.* 25 we seem to require the mention of something more closely connected with the deliverance of the righteous from cruel enemies than the statement of the righteous man's constant compassionateness. But here, as so often, the most obvious solutions of textual problems are not the best. Possibly the editor had before him an already corrupted text. But he certainly wished, living perhaps long after the psalmist, to efface the indications of mere temporary national dangers, and it is possible that a more critical editor would still have discerned the ethnic 'Jerahmeel.' That **לֶחֶם**, **כְּלִי-הַיּוֹם**, and **בִּרְכָּה** are elsewhere corruptions of **יִרְחֵמָאֵל** is practically certain; **לְבִרְכָּה** is still more plausibly viewed as a distorted 'ירח', and **וּמְלוּהוּ** may very possibly be another. As to **מִבְּקֵשׁ**, the **ב** may possibly have come from **ר**, and belong to **לֶחֶם** (a fragment of 'ירח'), and **מִקֵּשׁ** = **קֵשׁ** (cp. **מִשְׁקָה** in Gen. xv. 2) is very probably a corruption of **בִּשְׁשׁ**. **וְזָכְרוּ** seems an insertion from *v.* 21. Read, therefore, comparing line 20—

**וִירְעוּ בִּשְׁשׁ [יִפְרֹת]**  
**וּוִירְעוּ יִרְחֵמָאֵל [יִשְׁרָשׁ]**

58. M **וְשָׁכַן לְעוֹלָם**. Read **וְיִרְדְּפֵהוּ שָׁלוֹם**. Cp. on *l.* 6 From xxxiv. 15*b*.

61. M **וְשָׁמְרוּ לְעוֹלָם**; so J S T. But the first word should begin with **ע**, and **נִשְׁמָר** is elsewhere reflexive. Af<sup>23</sup> **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα φυλαχθήσονται** G gives **ἀνομοὶ δὲ ἐκδιωχθήσονται** (so N<sup>1001</sup> si T; B wrongly **ἄμωμοι ἐκδιωχθήσονται**), i.e. **עוֹלָיִם נִשְׁמָרוּ** (cp. Job<sup>10</sup> **παράνομοι**; so Houb., Kenn., Hu., Hi., Ley, Bā., &c.). This **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα** short for a line. Hence Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup> Du., Sievers insert **לְעוֹלָם**; **עוֹלָם** may have dropped out in M, **לְעוֹלָם** in G's text. But considering (1) that in *l.* 83 **לְעוֹלָם** does *not* occur, (2) that **עוֹלָם** in G generally = **ἄδικος**, once (Job xxix. 7) **παράνομος**, but never **ἀνομος**, and (3) that **עוֹלָם** nowhere occurs in Pss., while **עוֹלָה** occurs in this very psalm (*l.* 2), L<sup>100</sup>'s suggestion to restore the latter phrase alone is to be preferred.

68 f. M G אֲשֶׁרִי אֲשֶׁר being fem., אֲשֶׁר (sing.) is more natural. So Houb., Gr. Cp. Job xxxi. 7, אִם תִּטָּה אֲשֶׁרִי.—M צוֹפֶה. Franken-berg (*ZATW*, xv. 125) צִפֵּן. But see on x. 8.

77 f. M עֲרִין, tautologically, for ע' is a synonym for רָשָׁע. G *ὑπερψυχομενον*, perhaps נַעֲלָה. Duhm's reading עֲלִין = עֲלִין, or perhaps rather עֲלִין, seems better.—M וּמִתְעַרָּה, 'emptying itself'? G S suggest מִתְעַלָּה (cp. יתעל, Jer. li. 3?) or מִתְנַשָּׂא. Herz remarks on the accumulation of ר, א, ע, ה, and ח in *ll.* 77 f., and suggests מִשְׁרִישׁ. But since it is not the wicked *ἀπλῶς* whom at any rate the early psalmists denounce, but the N. Arabian oppressors, and since we have found the Jerahmeelites already spoken of (*ll.* 18, 20, 56), it is probable that ומתערה is a corruption of ירחמאל (ל and ת are liable to confusion).—M פִּאֲזָרָה רַעֲנָן; J, 'sicut indigenam virentem'; A, *ὡς αὐτόχθων εὐθαλής* (Field); S, *ὡς ἐν δρυμῷ ὁ αὐτόματος ἀνατείλας εὐθαλής*. G has *ὡς τὰς κέδρους τοῦ Λιβάνου*; and so G in Aphraates (Bä.); J (*Anecd. Maredsol.* iii. 1, 43), 'sicut cedrum (Vg., cedros) Libani,' i.e. פִּאֲזָרָה הַלְבֵנֹן. So Hi., Dy., Gr., Bä., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Kau., Du.; but We., Driv.<sup>(2)</sup>, רַעֲנָן. פִּאֲזָרָה רַעֲנָן is certainly an unfortunate word (see on lii. 10, xcii. 11), and some error is probable, but הַלְבֵנֹן [ה] is not the only possible one. If וּמֹת' represents מֹת', clearly רַעֲנָן must have come out of a participle, and עֲלִין, the adopted reading in *l.* 77, at once suggests מְרִנָּה (מ' and ע' easily con-founded): הַלְבֵנֹן presumably has come from בִּאֲזָרָה (cp. lii. 9).

79. M וַיַּעֲבֹר. Read וַיַּעֲבֹר (G S J, Houb., Kenn., Hi., De., &c.).

81. Read יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה תָּם (G S, Horsley, Street, Schorr, Kr., Gr., We., Du.).

85 f. Read תְּשׁוּעָה (S J, Gr., Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Bä., Kau., We.); also צָרָה הוּא, and continue יַעֲזֹרֵם (Du.).

174

## PSALM XXXVIII.

**TRIMETERS.** A psalm of complaint largely composed of reminiscences from Pss. vi., xxxi., xxxv., also from Isaiah. liii. (see on *l.* 25 f.). We can hardly say that a 'deep' sense of sin is expressed in it; the psalm is by no means entirely what we mean by 'penitential.'<sup>1</sup> The speaker does indeed admit himself to be guilty (*ll.* 7, 8), but he only infers his guilt from the magnitude of his affliction; he has no definite idea in what his guilt consists. He can only sigh and groan—he cannot truly 'confess' his sins (see on *v.* 19), and before uttering his last almost despairing cry he refers, quite simply and naturally, to his good deeds. The opposition of the Arabians, too, is a turning of evil for good (*v.* 21). That the speaker is the pious community is surely certain. The variety of the details of the description shows that it is allegorical, and this is confirmed by the closing

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 113 f.

stanza, which is a prayer, not for the healing of a malady, but for deliverance from enemies. That critical scholars like B. Jacob and Duhm should think otherwise is strange (cp. on Ps. vi.). It is *plausible* indeed to suppose that when לְהִזְכִּיר ('to bring to remembrance') was inserted in the title, the psalm was regarded as one suitable for a sick man to use in the confession of sin (B. Jacob, *ZATW*, xvii. 52, 63 ff.). If, however, we reject the ordinary view which finds a reference to the 'azkārū (Lev. xxiv. 7), it is best to explain לְהִזְכִּיר as a corruption of לְאֶזְרָחִי, 'of the Ezrahite,' and to suppose that there were two competing assignments of Ps. xxxviii., to David and to Ethan or Heman respectively. The case of Ps. xxxix. is exactly parallel. See also on Ps. lxx., title. In some MSS. of G, in the Syro-hex. text, and in the lately published Sahidic version, there is an addition to v. 21, which runs in the Greek thus, καὶ ἀπέριψάν με τὸν ἀγαπητὸν ὡσεὶ νεκρὸν ἐβδελυγμένον, whence derived we know not. See Field's *Hes.*, and Bū.'s note.

*Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan: of [Ethan] the Ezrahite. Of the Ishmaelites.*

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
|    |  | I  |
| I  | O Yahwè ! punish me not in thy +full+ indignation,     | 2  |
|    | Nor chastise me in thy +full+ fury :                   |    |
|    | For thine arrows have sunk into me,                    | 3  |
|    | And upon me thou hast laid thy hand.                   |    |
|    | Nowhere is my body sound because of thy wrath,         | 4  |
|    | Nowhere is my frame healthy because of my punishment ; |    |
|    | For through my guiltiness my body is parched,          | 5  |
|    | Through my trespass my frame is become rotten.         |    |
|    | My stripes are become noisome,                         | 6  |
| 10 | They fester because of my unrighteousness.             |    |
|    | Through my guiltiness I am bowed down greatly,         | 7  |
|    | I walk about trembling continually.                    |    |
|    | For my loins are filled with anguish,                  | 8  |
|    | [I have] no rest in my pangs ;                         |    |
|    | I am benumbed, I am crushed exceedingly,               | 9  |
|    | I groan because of the sighing of my heart.            |    |
|    | Lord ! before thee is all my crying,                   | 10 |
|    | My sighing is not hidden from thee ;                   |    |
|    | The strength of my right hand has left me,             | 11 |
| 20 | And the light of mine eyes is no more with me.         |    |
|    | Mine enemies stand to behold my stroke, <sup>1</sup>   | 12 |
|    | And whisper [gathered together] at my calamity ;       |    |
|    | Those that are intent on my harm speak insults,        | 13 |
|    | And talk of outrages continually.                      |    |

<sup>1</sup> And my kinsmen stand afar off.



- But I am like a deaf man that hears not, 14  
 Like a speechless man that cannot open his mouth ;  
 I behave myself as a man that is stupefied, 15  
 And in whose mouth are no arguments.
- Yea, for thee, O Yahwè, do I wait ; 16  
 30 Thou wilt answer, O Lord, my God ;  
 For I say, 'Lest they rejoice over me, 17  
 And jeer when my foot falters!'
- I +indeed+ am set +ready+ for wounding, 18  
 Pains continually await me ;  
 Yea, I moan because of my stroke, ' 19  
 I pine away because of my punishment ;
- Those of Jerahmeel are strong, 20  
 Ishmael and Cush are many in number ;  
 They recompense [me with] evil, 21  
 40 Those of Rehoboth are at feud with me.
- Forsake me not, O Yahwè ! 22  
 O my God ! be not far from me.  
 Hasten hither to my help, 23  
 O Lord, +hasten+ [to] my succour !

1 f. A quotation from vi. 2.—3.  
*Arrows.* Cp. Job vi. 4a, xvi. 13.—4.  
*Thy hand.* Cp. xxxii. 4a.—5 f. Cp.  
 Isa. i. 5 f. (of Israel).

15. **Benumbed** (נפונתי); cp.  
 lxxvii., *l.* 11. — **Crushed** (נרכיתי).  
 Cp. xliv. 19, and cp. on xxxvii., *l.* 9.

21. **My stroke**, ננעי; so *l.* 35;  
 cp. lxxiii. 14. *J lepram meam*; see  
 Lev. xiii. 3. Cp. the description in  
 xli. 7 f.

25 f. Cp. Isa. liii. 7, where the  
 servant of Yahwè (*i.e.* the pious kernel  
 of Israel) is described. This casts a  
 clear light on the question as to the  
 speaker in the psalm and as to the date.  
 For Isa. liii. must already have been  
 some time in circulation to be referred  
 to in this indirect way. Cp. also  
 xxxix. 10, where, however, it is the patient  
 endurance of God's chastisement which  
 is referred to. Here it is the reproaches  
 of the enemy which the speaker suffers  
 in silence, waiting patiently for his  
 God.

28. תוכחות, 'arguments in  
 self-justification,' as Job xxiii. 4.

29-40. The connexion of the dis-  
 tichs has caused some perplexity.  
 Various proposals have been made (see  
 Ol., Now., Du.), based on the sup-  
 position that here and there the poet  
 mentally turns back and supports what  
 he said before, but with insufficient  
 explanation. The chief difficulty is  
 caused by *v.* 19 (*ll.* 35 f.), which, in  
 M, contains a declaration on the part  
 of the speaker that he confesses his  
 sins, *i.e.* (according to Ol.) is no  
 longer an obstinate sinner as formerly.  
 Ol. thinks that such a declaration is  
 either to be connected with *v.* 16b (*l.* 30),  
 or—a view which he seems to prefer—  
 be intended as the justification of *v.*  
 18 (*ll.* 33 f.), 'I fear the worst and am  
 full of grief, for I must confess that I  
 have well deserved complete ruin.'  
 Du. carries out these exegetical theories  
 to their logical result, and makes the  
 order of the verses, 16-19 ; 17-18 ; 20-  
 21. Correction of the text, however,

permits, or rather requires, us to dispense with this. The course of thought seems to be this. The speaker makes no reply to his insulting foes because he waits for the divine interposition. To God, however, he *can* speak; God's honour is concerned. The calamity of Yahwe's servant will draw forth comments injurious to Him (cp. xiii. 5 [—], xxxv. 24 f.). In v. 18 (*ll.* 33 f.),

which M again distorts, the speaker returns to himself and his sufferings, which have reached their extreme limit; he adds that the strong opposition to him has, from a human point of view, no moral justification (cp. introd.). Cp. xxxv. 12, cix. 5.

41-44. Cp. xxii. 12, 20, xxxv. 22, xl. 14, lxxi. 12, &c.

*Critical Notes.* Title. The triple assignment in the title is very remarkable. The third of the corrupt readings here represented is derived from G, which closes the title with *περὶ τοῦ σαββαίου*. I take it that G's Heb. MS. had *עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית = עַל־הַשְּׁבַת* (= *לְיִשְׁמְעָאֵלִים*). See introd., and on title of Ps. xcii.; so read also in Pss. vi. 1, xii. 1.

2 ff. Insert *אֵל*. That M's text is grammatical (Kön., *Synt.*, § 352 n) does not justify us in deviating from vi. 2 against metre.—Point *נָחַתוּ* (Du.).—For *וְתִנָּחַת* (very improbable after *נָחַתוּ*) read *וְתִנָּחַת* (Gr.); G *ἐπεσθῆναι*.

5 f. M *מָתָם*. Kön (ii. 1, p. 98) thinks the pointing influenced by the much more common synonym *תָּם*; according to rule, it should have been *מָתָם*. Since, as Kön. himself holds, *מָתָם* in Judg. xx. 48 is incorrect, the only proof-passages for *מָתָם* are Ps. xxxiii. 4, 8 and Isa. i. 6. A scribe's error is the cause; read *תָּמִים*, and cp. *Isaiah* (Heb.), *SBOT*, pp. 110, 197.—M *הַמָּאֲתִי*, not quite suitable. Read either *תִּבְחֶיךָ* or *הַבּוֹרֵאֲתִי*. Cp. lxxiii. 14.

7. M *בִּי־עֲוֹנֹתַי עָבְרוּ רֹאשִׁי*. In lxix. 3, 16 and elsewhere, being submerged by a flood is a figure for the danger, in which Israel was, of being cut off by some great national calamity. If, therefore, *עָבְרוּ רֹאשִׁי* is correct, *עֲוֹנֹתַי* must be a corruption of *שְׁבָלִים*, 'floods,' or the like; the expression found in M is improper, even if, unjustifiably, we render 'עו' 'my punishments.' The corruption, however, lies chiefly in 'ר' *עו*. The simplest correction is *בִּי־עֲוֹנֹתַי חָרַב בְּשָׂרִי*; *ב* easily fell out after *כ*. This, however, is not so certain as the correction of the next line.

8. M *כְּבֹדוֹ יִכְבְּדוּ מִמֶּנִּי*. This form of text is condemned by its inconsistency with the preceding line, however read. It also gives one beat too much; this, however, could be remedied by omitting *כְּבֹד* as an incomplete form of *יִכְבְּדוּ*. No one familiar with textual corruption can hesitate much as to the true reading which underlies the text; it almost certainly is

\* 9 f. The text is in some disorder. To produce two lines, we must transpose two words, reading **הִבְאִישׁוּ חֲבוּרָתִי | נִמְקוּ מִפְּנֵי עוֹלָתִי**. 'חב' gives two beats. **עוֹלָתִי** is an easy and necessary correction. Ges.-Bu. no doubt gives '**אֵוֶלֶת**', 2. godlessness, fault, Ps. xxxviii. 6 (cp. **נִבְלָה**), lxix. 6.' But to make 'godlessness, fault' even plausible it would be necessary to find a passage, the context of which was not corrupt, where this sense was probable. The context of both the passages referred to is adverse to the sense (or, the *senses*?) claimed by Ges.-Bu. In xxxviii. 6 a word meaning 'sin, transgression,' and in lxix. 6 a word meaning 'crying' or 'groaning' are indispensable. On **אֵוֶל**, cvii. 17, Job v. 3 (interpreted similarly by Ges.-Bu.), see crit. n. on the former passage.

11. **נַעֲוִיתִי**. Ges.-Bu. finds the sense 'to be bowed down,' 'to bow oneself down,' in Ps. xxxviii. 7, Isa. xxi. 3. But in Isa. xxi. 3, 'to become giddy' is clearly the right sense (see Di.-Ki.), and here 'inverted parallelism' suggests that we should read **מַעֲוִיתִי**. **נַעֲוִיתִי** (We.) is plausible, but does not connect so well with ll. 9 f.

12. **מִקָּרֵר**, generally rendered 'as a mourner.' Rather **חֲרָד**, and so xlii. 10, xliii. 2, and in Jer. viii. 21, xiv. 2, **חֲרָדוֹ חֲרָדְתִּי**.—**מִדֹּלֶכְתִּי**; cp. 1 K. xxi. 27. But **הַתֵּר** is better (Gr.); cp. xxxv. 14.

13 f. **מִנִּקְלָה**. G *ἐμπαγμών*; A *ἡτμίας*; J *ignominia*; so Bā., *Schmach*. But this would be **קָלֶון**. T **קִדְיוֹתָא**, whence Gr. **דלקה** (= **דלקת**, 'a fever'). Most moderns, 'burnt' (partic.) = inflammation! Read **חִלְחָלָה** (Nah. ii. 11), or **חִילָה** (Job vi. 10).—**מִוַּיִן מַתַּם בַּבְּשָׂרִי**, an editorial makeshift which does not even provide a complete line (see l. 6). Read perhaps **בְּצִירִי** [**לִי**] **כִּנּוּחַ**; cp. Jer. xlv. 3, Lam. i. 3. The parallelism is excellent (cp. Isa. xxi. 3).

16. **מִנְהַמַּת**. If this be right, we must read **לְבִיא** for **לְבִי** (so Hi., Ol., Gr., Bā., Kau., We., Du.); **נַהֵם** specially means the growling of the lion (Isa. v. 29, Prov. xxviii. 15). But the combination of **שֶׁאֵן** and **נַהֵם** is very improbable; 'I roar louder than a lion's growling' is unsatisfactory. Read, with Herz, **מִיֶּאֱנֶה**; G *ἀπὸ στεναγμοῦ*. The repetition of **נ** in M illustrates the dittographic tendency. Note the good connexion with ll. 17 f.

17. **מִתְאַוִּיתִי**; against parallelism. Read **שׁוֹעֲתִי** (Herz); see on lxix. 6.

19 f. M prefixes **לְבִי סַחֲרָדָר**, which, with **כַּחֲזִי**, would give four beats. It is rendered, 'my heart beats violently.' But this sense of **ס** is purely imaginary. Gr.'s **חֲמַרְמַר** is not very suitable, and

metre still protests. Looking closely at the preceding words, we see that **לְבַסְחָרָהּ** is an editorial patch on the basis of a corrupt dittogram **לְאַנְסְתָּרָהּ**. Now turn to *l.* 20. M's **בְּמִיָּהם**, in apposition to **עֵינַי**, is—in spite of the accents—impossible. Hos. xiii. 2, Am. ix. 11, Zech. viii. 10, quoted in illustration by Kön. (*Synt.*, § 349 i) are certainly all corrupt. Probably **גְּמָהּ** is a corruption of **יְמִיָּה**; **ג** comes from **נ** (repeated), the final **מ** = **ני**. Read in *l.* 19 **נִפְחַ יְמִיָּה**.

21 f. M **אֶהְיֶה | וְרַעִי**. It is true that the unkind behaviour of friends is a recurring feature in the parallel descriptions (see on xxxi. 12). But here the poet is hampered by the structure of his poem, and he can only find room for the conduct of Israel's enemies in general, among whom he may include Israel's false friends. Certainly the force of the passage gains greatly by the correction and the omissions here proposed. Read **אֵיבִי**, omitting **וְרַעִי** (note Pasek) and **וּקְרֹבִי מִרְחוֹק עִמּוֹ**, as glosses on **אֶהְיֶה**.—M **וַיִּנְקְשׁוּ | מִבְּקָשֵׁי נַפְשִׁי**. 'Laid snares' does not suit the parallelism, and **נִקְשׁ** is probably non-existent. Ps. ix. 17, cix. 11 are treated elsewhere. In Dt. xii. 30 we should read **תִּוְקֶשׁ**. In 1 S. xxviii. 9 **כִּתְנַקֵּשׁ** should be **תִּתֵּן מִוְקֶשׁ**. Read here **וַיִּתְלַחֲשׁוּ [יָחַד] לְמִכְשׁוֹל**. Read **נַפְשִׁי** (xli. 8, xxxv. 12).

23 ff. M **הָהוּת**. Read **חֲרָפוֹת**. See on v. 10, lii. 4.—M **מִרְמוֹת**. Read **כְּלָמוֹת**.—M **אֶשְׁמַע**. Read **יִשְׁמַע** (Gr.).

27. M **לֹא־שָׁמַע**. Read **שָׁמַעוֹן** (Ezek. iv. 16, xii. 19).

32. Read **וּבְמוֹט רִגְלִי יִלְעִינִי** (G καί). M's **עָלִי** (יִלַּע) may be a fragment of **יִלְעִינִי**, which word has become, in M, **יִגְדִּילִי** (see on xxxv. 26, xli. 10, lv. 13).

33. M **לְצַלַּע**; **ל** dittographed. Read **לְפָצֵעַ** (xxxv. 15); G εἰς μύστιγας.

35. M's **עֵינַי** and **חֲטָאתִי** are unsuitable. The latter should be **תּוֹכַחְתִּי** (see on *l.* 5 f.), the former probably **נִגְעִי**. M's **אֲנִיד** (G ἀναγγεῖλω) should probably be **אֶהְיֶה**, and **אֶדְאֵנָה** (G περιμνήσω) **אֶדְאֵב**.

37 f. M G **חַיִּים**. Most since Houb. and Lowth read **חֲנָם**; both readings, however, spring from **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**. Probably **וְאֵיבִי** is also a fragment of this word. Comparing xxxv. 19 (corr. text), read **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים עֲצָמוֹ וְרַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל וְכוּשׁ**.

39. M **וּישְׁלֹמוּ עָלַי רַעֲהָ**. Read **וּישְׁלֹמוּ עָלַי רַעֲהָ** (cix. 5a).—M **תַּחַת טוֹבָה יִשְׁמְנוֹנִי תַּחַת רְדוּפִיטוֹב**; partly an accumulation of corrupt forms of **רְחִיבוּתִים**. Read **רַחֲבִי יִשְׁמְנוֹנִי**; cf. cix. 4a, 'Rehoboth and Maacath are at feud with me.'

44. Read **לְתַשׁוּעָתִי** (Hi., Bi.).

## PSALM XXXIX.

Ps. xxxix. in its present form somewhat reminds us of Ps. xc.; in both psalms (see especially on Ps. xc.) the evidence of composite origin and of editorial manipulation is too strong to be disregarded. Ps. xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> (pentameters) describes the mental agony of a large number of the more inquiring members of the pious Jewish community; xxxix.<sup>(2)</sup> contains the tender pleadings of a member of a much less critical school of thought, inserted by the editor as an antidote to the dangerous freedom of the original psalm (xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup>). The problem which troubled the original psalmist and those whom he represents was the inconsistency between the traditional orthodoxy and the facts of daily experience. It was an inherited belief that righteousness was attended by prosperity and wickedness by adversity, but the oppression of the pious community by N. Arabian and even Jewish tyrants seemed to many to give the lie to this doctrine. Thus Ps. xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> is to be grouped, both as to the subject and as to the mode of treating the subject, with Ps. lxxiii. (vv. 11-14), and, as regards the subject, to some extent with Pss. xxxvii. and xlix. Parts of Pss. lxxxix. (vv. 47-50) and cxvi. (v. 11) are also closely parallel, and the curious points of contact between xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> and Isa. lix. should not be overlooked. So much at least may be assumed, that Pss. xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> and lxxxiii. were not widely separated by the date of their composition. But we can go further than this. Both psalms are later than the dialogues of the Book of Job, for both have been influenced by them; indeed, Ps. xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> is like an abstract of the most thrilling parts of the complaints of Job. It should be added that xxxix.<sup>(2)</sup> (if the last two lines are not later insertions) must also be fairly late, for l. 7 comes from 1 Chr. xxix. 15, and l. 8, with slight alterations, from Job x. 20 f.

In 'A Study in the Criticism of the Psalms' (*Expositor*, April 1899, pp. 252-263) I pointed out that Ps. xxxix. is one of those psalms which gain most from a thorough textual criticism. Since that essay was printed Duhm has independently arrived at somewhat similar results, though his textual criticism appears very incomplete. He is of opinion that vv. 9, 11, 13, 14 were inserted in xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> from another composition, and that they may originally have formed the continuation of Ps. xxxviii. After omitting these verses, he finds in Ps. xxxix. a wonderful expression of a longing after immortality, which could not justify itself logically, and sprang from the writer's deep sense of the reality of his communion with God. In v. 5b Duhm reads חַדְלֵנִי אֲנִי, 'whether I must cease to be.'

One may be allowed to doubt whether a keen criticism will permit us to adopt this view. כִּתִּי אֲחַדְלֵנִי, 'when I shall cease (to be),' would furnish a better sequel to מִיָּד יָמִי; indeed, Grätz actually gets this sense out of מָה חַדְלֵנִי אֲנִי.

But here, as in Isa. xxxviii. 11, חַדְלֵנִי is certainly wrong (see crit. note). I fear it will have to be admitted that Ps. xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> is as direct a denial of resurrection, and therefore also of immortality, as the 14th chapter of Job. No wonder that, partly by accident, partly by the skill of the ancient editor, this denial should have been veiled from later ages.

## XXXIX.—1.

*Deposited: Of 'Arab-ethan. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. 1*

1 I said, 'Let me guard my words | that I sin not with my tongue; 2

Let me put a guard on my mouth | while the wicked confronts me.'

I was dumb, I kept silence continually, | but my pain awaked +the more+. 3

For my heart was astounded, | my reins were horror-struck. 4

Then I spoke in my error, | \* \* \* \*  
 Make me, [I pray,] to know | the end of the Jerahmeelites. 5  
 Behold, my confidence thou hast overthrown, | my hope  
 [thou hast destroyed]: 6  
 My perfectness is as nothing before thee ; | surely a +mere+  
 breath is all piety !  
 Surely in gloom man goeth away ; | surely in darkness he  
 dies ; 7  
 10 He lieth down, [and will not arise,] | nor awake out of  
 his sleep.  
 • [Some lines, say six, are wanting.]  
 In the midst of gloom I grope, | I am become like the owls ; 12  
 18 All my piety is like spiders' webs ; | surely a +mere +  
 breath is all piety !

[Conclusion wanting.]

XXXIX.—2.

*Editorial substitutes for missing passages of xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup>*

1 And now, Lord, what wait I for ? | My hope is in thee. 8  
 From all my transgressions rescue me, | expose me not to  
 the insulting of the impious. 9  
 I am dumb, I open not my mouth, | for it is thou that  
 hast done it. 10  
 Remove from me thy stroke, | by the might of thy hand  
 I am terror-struck. 11  
 Hear my prayer, O Yahwè ! | hearken to my cry ; 13  
 Hold not thy peace at my tears ; | \* \* \* \*  
 For I am a sojourner beside thee, | one devoid of rights,  
 like all my fathers.  
 Avert thy frown, that I may be cheerful again, | before I  
 go hence and cease to be. 14

xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> If. **Isaid**, &c. The speaker is constantly hoping for a just retribution to fall on the wicked (cp. Job v. 3). The longer it is delayed the more he murmurs inwardly against Yahwè. He strives, however, to restrain the expression of his thoughts, lest he should 'sin with his tongue,' and so cast in his lot with the transgressors.—4. Cp. lxxiii. 21, and see crit. n.—5. Cp. cxvi. 11.

6. The utterance begins in a tem-

perate style ; presently, however, it will become intemperate.

7 f. Cp. Job iv. 6, 'Is not thy fear of God, thy trust, And the perfectness [integrity] of thy ways thy hope?' Job ix. 22, 'He destroys the perfect and the wicked.' Ps. lxxiii. 13, 'Verily, I have cleansed my heart in vain.' Also cxvi. 11 (corr. text), 'I said in my haste, All piety is a lie (=disappointment).'<sup>2</sup>—9. Cp. on l. 17, also Job xix. 8, xxvii. 20.

10. Based upon Job xiv. 12; strange that this dark view has found expression even in a psalm, but not strange that an editor has corrected it.

17. A thrilling, even if not very poetical, expression of the psalmist's melancholy state of mind. Cp. Job v. 14, and especially Isa. lix. 10, 'We grope like blind men by the wall. . . . We stumble at noonday as in the

twilight.'—18. *Spiders' webs*. In Isa. lix. 5 f. (part of an inserted passage) the same figure is used of the works of the wicked.

xxxix.<sup>(2)</sup> 1. Cp. xxxviii. 15.—3. *I am dumb*. Cp. note on xxxviii. 14.—7. Quoted from 1 Chr. xxix. 15, though the reverse of this is, of course, not impossible.—8. Based on Job x. 20 f.

*Critical Notes.* xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> 1. M דררי, 'my conduct' (1 K. viii. 25)—too wide a term. Read דְּבָרִי (Gr., Hal.); cf. on xvii. 4.

2. M אשמרה a second time! Read אֲשִׁימָה (cf. 2 K. xix. 28), with Ol., Dy., Bi., Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Bā., Kau., Hal., Herz. G ἐθέμην.—M מִחֶסֶם, 'a muzzle' (ἀπ. λεγ.). Most unsuitable. Read שְׁמָרָה (cxli. 3a), with Herz. Cp. on ix. 21. As often, the two parts of the word are transposed; corruption followed.—M בָּעוֹר. Read בַּעֲמוֹד (Gr., Herz). G ἐν τῷ συστήναι. Cf. עַד for עֵבֶר, 1 S. ii. 5; also on civ. 33, cxlvi. 2.

3. M דּוּמִיָּה, a non-existent word (see on xxii. 3); מְטוֹב. Both are obviously miswritten for תְּמִיד. Cf. on cxxxi. 2. Hitz.'s ingenuity cannot rescue מְטוֹב (a 'shortened formula!'); cf. on xv. 4. Metre and sense gain.—M נִעְפָּר, 'thrown into disorder.' Read נִעֵר (נִעֵר), the only suitable word, reserving כ (כי) for next line.

4 f. M's text might pass if we could only correct בהיני so as to produce a complete parallelism; הני is non-existent (see on v. 2). Of course, בְּהִינִי will not do, and Gr.'s בגוי (suggested by S) is a most unexpected Aramaism (= בקרבי); cf. G, xxiii. 4a. Let us then look a little more closely at the text. Is the figure of the fire quite a natural one? In Dt. xix. 6, Hos. vii. 7, Jer. xx. 9 (cf. vi. 11), it denotes a craving for vengeance. But here the danger in which the speaker felt himself to be was that of uttering sceptical words as to the value of piety (cf. lxxiii. 13, 14). It was not a sin to be angry with God's enemies; but it was a sin to envy their prosperity. We cannot therefore correct בהיני alone; we must correct the whole couplet (ll. 4, 5), and the way to do so is plain from lxxiii. 21. Taking up כ (כי) from l. 3, read כִּי יתמה לבי (לכבי), וכליותי אשתומם. כל fell away from יתמה וי; כליותי from יו; naturally passed into קר. Thus l. 4a arose. בהיני is a dittogram of בקרבי, which a scribe manipulated to make a show of sense. אש and תומם were transposed. ו naturally became ב, and ס became ר. The change of מ into ע is rare; but an imperfect form, in an older form of the square character, can easily be mistaken for a ע.—To l. 5 prefix או, for metre and sense; it fell out easily after אש (in M).—M בְּלִשְׁוֹנִי. Read בְּשִׁלּוֹתִי, 'in my error' (Aram. שְׁלוּ, 'error'). Cp. Prov. i. 32, where שְׁלוֹה is || מְשִׁיבָה, 'turning away,' 'rebellion,' and ascribed to כְּסִילִים.

6. Whether we assign *v.* 5 to xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> or to xxxix.<sup>(2)</sup>, M's text is very unsuitable. Is it conceivable that the psalmist means to ask God how long he (or Israel) will live? His temptation is to believe that God is on the side of Israel's enemies (the Jerahmeelites and their allies). The exact duration of Israel's lingering death cannot be prominent in his thoughts. Besides, the phraseology is very strange; that קָץ and מְדָה are not parallel is obvious (see Hupfeld). Evidently the original text of the psalm had become in many parts very indistinct. The editor, discontented perhaps with what he could read, naturally 'restored' the indistinct parts in accordance with his own chastened feelings. *L.* 6 should probably run (inserting נָא), קָץ יִרְחַמְאֵלִים, | הוֹדִיעֵנִי נָא יְהוָה. This assumes that יִרְחַמְאֵל was written twice over; the first time it became corrupted into יוֹמֶדֶת, the second into יוֹמֵי מוֹדֶהוּיָא. *V.* 5b may originally have run, יִרְחַמְאֵלִים [קָץ] אֲדַעָה, a variant to our line 6. Critics have been much troubled by the text of M G. For חָדַל (arbitrarily rendered by many 'frail,' 'perishable') Hu. reads חָלַד, rendering *quantilli sim air* (cp. the commentators on Isa. xxxviii. 11, and see *SBOT ad loc.*). חָלַד, however, is a very doubtful word (see next note). On Duhm's emendation see introd.

7 f. 'Behold, thou hast made my days handbreadths, and my lifetime (?) is as nothing before thee' (M) is far from satisfactory. For חָלַדִּי G rightly reads תַּחֲלָתִי (*ἡ τριτάτης μου*), and so in lxxxix. 48 (*ἡ τρίτος. μου*) In xvii. 14, xlix. 2 חָלַד is equally doubtful (see notes), and in Job x. 20, xi. 17 we should read חֲבִלֶךָ, חֲבִלִּי. Thus חָלַד disappears altogether both from our psalm and from the O.T. as a whole. If so, and if קָצִי is wrong, we can have no interest in defending טַפְחוֹת (note Pasek). Probably the true reading is בְּמַחְתִּי (Isa. xxx. 15), and the context (*v.* 7) suggests נִתְצַתָּה for נִתְהַתָּה. Then as to יוֹמֵי. If אָדָם should be חָסֵד (at any rate a probable correction), should not יוֹמֵי be corrected into תַּמִּי? הָיָה and חָסֵד are perfect parallels, and תַּמָּה, הָיָה, and (adj.) תָּם are characteristic words of the Book of Job—the chief monument of the school of thought to which our psalmist belongs. Transpose יוֹמֵי תַּמִּי (תַּמִּי) and חָלַדִּי (תַּחֲלָתִי), and all becomes clear. The psalmist cannot have said, 'My hope is as nothing in thy sight,' but he may have said, 'My perfectness (תַּמִּי) is as nothing in thy sight'; and if he wrote in *L.* 9a, 'My confidence thou hast overthrown,' it is presumable that תַּחֲלָתִי should find a place in *L.* 9b, combined with a verb such as הִאֲבִידָה (Job xiv. 19).

8d. M אֵד פִּלְיָהֶבֶל פִּלְאָדָם נֶצֶב סֻלָּה. Omit the first כָּל, with 'A 2 and many MSS. כָּ was dittographed (S, כְּהֵבֶל); then לָ was



inserted under the influence of the כל before אדם. אדם, however, is deeply corrupt; as in Hos. xi. 4 (Gr.) and Ps. cxvi. 11 we should read חסד (ס and מ are pretty often confounded). The wrong reading אדם was suggested by lxii. 10. אִךְ בְּצִלְמָת נָצַב סֵלָה comes, probably, from אִךְ בְּצִלְמָת, with which l. 5 should open. נָצַב baffles all translators; a 'sort of copula between subject and predicate' (We.) it cannot be, and Duhm's עֲלֵה־בֶּל (a further predicate to חֲלֵה־י) is in the highest degree forced. Herz suggested נָצַר.

9. M אִישׁ יֵתָה אִךְ בְּצִלְמָת; W F, '(Man walks) but as an apparition'; De Witt, 'Only a shadow (each goeth about)'. צֶלֶם, 'an unsubstantial image, as lxxiii. 20' (Bä.). But the text there is highly suspicious, and the only sure senses are 'image, sketch, model'; the etymology, too, is disputed (see the Lexx.). Nor is ב *essentie* natural in connexion with הֵלֶךְ. Read אִךְ בְּצִלְמוֹת הֵלֶךְ אִישׁ. 'The error has arisen from a faulty concatenation of the letters and the change of ו into י. בָּצֶלֶם then coalesces with the ית of the following word to form 'צלמות' (an anonymous writer in *Journ. of Sacred Lit.*, new series, iv. 328-343). This view is confirmed by my own independent correction of the text of ll. 13, 14. Ibn Janāḥ (*Book of Roots*, s.v.) gives the right sense יתהלכו בחשכה, but obtains this (for בָּצֶלֶם) through Ar. كَلَمٌ, 'to be dark.' So Donash; Menahem ben Saruk, however, rightly explains צֶלֶם 'image.'—M אִךְ הֵבֵל יֵתָה יִהְיֶיךָ. This does not suit the context. Something much more effective than a trite maxim on the vanity of human striving is required, even if we suppose vv. 7-14 to have been written consecutively. First of all we want a parallel to בְּצִלְמָת; next, a verb which shall explain הֵלֶךְ, and lead on to an adequate justification of כִּלְחָדָה. Read אִךְ יֵתָה בְּאִפְלָה יָמוֹת. Cp. lix. 9, and see exeg. note on l. 19.

10. M יִרְבֵּץ [וְלֹא יָקִיִּם] יִצְבֵּר וְלֹא יֵדַע מִרְאסָפָם. Read probably יִרְבֵּץ [וְלֹא יָקִיִּם] יִצְבֵּר וְלֹא יֵדַע מִשְׁנָתוֹ; cp. Job xiv. 12. רָבֵץ of men, as Job xi. 19.

11 f. M's text may be rendered, 'With chastisements for guilt +when+ thou disciplinest a man, thou destroyest, like the moth, all that he prizes'—a very strange interruption of a fervent personal supplication. Let us consider the parts of M separately. And first, בְּתוֹכָחוֹת יִשְׁרָתָ אִישׁ עֲלֵעָוֹן (note Pasek). Here the phrase עֲלֵעָוֹן is very suspicious. There could be no doubt that the 'chastisements' were 'on account of guilt,' and in the parallel line we find a figure from the animal world. Somewhere in l. 13 there must once have been some very striking figure. Let us write the letters continuously as far as the Pasek, and scan them closely, עֲלֵעָוֹן. Remembering what

goes before and what follows after, can we hesitate to read this (down to ל) בַּתּוֹךְ צִלְמוֹת (ל) עוֹן remains. Connect it with the next group of letters, עוֹנִיסֶרֶת. This may represent מִשְׁשֶׁתַּי; מ = נ; ס = מ; עו = ש, ר = י. אִישׁ, however, is as yet unaccounted for. Next, then, take אִישׁ וְתַמָּס בָּעֵשׂ הַמּוֹדוֹ. This is too much for *l.* 11*b*; the latter part of it must belong to *l.* 12. תַּמָּס occurs once again in the Pss., viz. in lviii. 9. Both passages are figurative, and in both תַּמָּס can only be explained as a slightly corrupted fragment of תַּנְשַׁמֶּת, 'screech-owls' (see on lviii. 9). In Isa. lix. 10 the same word for owls has become יִנְשָׁף, parallel to נִשָּׁף, *i.e.* יִנְשָׁף. After making this correction, we see at once that אִישׁ ו can have arisen from נִמְשַׁלְתִּי לְ. We have now only to explain כַּעֵשׂ הַמּוֹדוֹ. This is not quite long enough for *l.* 12*a*. G has *ὡς ἀράχνη* = כַּעֲכָבִישׁ. In truth, עֵשׂ is several times miswritten for עַכְבִּישׁ (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Moth,' 'Spider'). This puts us on the right track. Should not כַּעֵשׂ be עַכְבִּישׁ (cf. Isa. lix. 5; and see on xc. 9)? הַמּוֹדוֹ should presumably be חֲסִדִּי.

xxxix.<sup>(2)</sup> 4. M בַּתְּנִגֶּרֶת תִּג. 'תִּג' should mean 'strife'; see T, xxxi. 21. But the word is not Hebrew. G ἀπὸ τῆς ἰσχυρῆς, *i.e.* מִגְבִּירֶת (Schwally, *ZATW*, xi. 258 f.).—M אֲנִי כָלִיתִי. Read נִבְהַלְתִּי, a more natural verb (vi. 2 f.).

8. M הָשַׁע, 'besmear,' or (Kön., i. 380) 'press-to (thine eyes).' Rather שָׁעָה (Hu., Gr., Bā., Beer, Du.). [So now We. (*Skizzen*, vi. 173).] Cp. Job vii. 19, xiv. 6, and especially x. 20, where read וְשָׁעָה with G, Gr.

## PSALM XL.—I.

**PENTAMETERS.** A thanksgiving for a deliverance out of great national danger which forms the climax of a long series of divine lovingkindnesses. How shall the speaker (*i.e.* the inner circle of Israel) display his gratitude? To material sacrifices Yahwè is indifferent; his delight is in thanksgiving (*l.* 14, 23). Thanksgiving therefore has been the chief employment of the association of God's Poor; in the full assembly of Yahwè's worshippers he has declared God's righteousness with the eloquence of one who 'delights' in the wonders of Yahwè's purposes. In return, let not Yahwè restrain his compassionate impulse to befriend and protect Israel. Parallel passages are—xxii.<sup>(2)</sup>, xxx. 2-5, xxxiii. 3, l. 8-13, li. 18, lxix., xcii. 6 f., cxxxix. 18 f. Jer. xvii. 7 is alluded to in a gloss (*v.* 5), and the supposed reference to Jer. xxxi. 33 falls with M's incorrect text of *v.* 8. (It is on *v.* 8 and *v.* 3 that Hitzig bases his theory of Jeremiah's authorship; on *v.* 3 see *exeg.* note.)

From this psalm and from Pss. l. and li. 3-19 we gather that there was a tendency in post-exilic Israel opposed to that chiefly represented by Ezra. It is not needful to suppose that the authors of these psalms were as violently opposed as Jeremiah to the sacrificial system; they may very possibly have held that sacrifices were provisionally enjoined for the 'hardness of men's hearts,' and

many members of the school doubtless dwelt with pleasure on the symbolic meanings which they were able to extract from the 'Mosaic' Law. Of this symbolism there is no trace in the three psalms here mentioned, and the attempt to symbolize, however inevitable, would ultimately have done much harm to Jewish theology but for the collapse of the entire sacrificial system at the fall of the temple. See further *OP*, 363-368; *JRL*, 250-257; Beer, p. xi.; Roy, 55; Smend, *AT Rel.-gesch.* (2), 197 f.; Marti, *Gesch. der Isr. Rel.*, 262.

Roy's view that passages in Ps. xl. refer to the Jews of the Dispersion is attractive; Jews at a distance from the sanctuary would naturally be much comforted by v. 7. The speaker represents the strictest circle of Jews at Jerusalem, but he also addresses the '*anāvim* (v. 4b, corr. text) outside; these '*anāvim* are obviously Jews of the Dispersion. The Servant of Yahwè at Jerusalem has a mission of encouragement to faithful Jews at a distance from the temple, represented by those whose privilege it has been to come up as pilgrims to Jerusalem at the Feast. The correctness of Roy's view is not affected by his adherence to M's text of v. 4b. On this and other points of interpretation see *Christian Use of the Psalms*, pp. 123-141.

*Deposited. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

I I had waited longingly for Yahwè, [to him I cried,] 2  
He leaned [his ear] toward me, | and heard my cry.

He brought me up from the pit of ruin, | from the miry  
bottom of the sea ; 3

He planted my feet upon a rock, | made firm my steps ;

In my mouth he laid a new song, | a praiseful song to our 4  
God ;

Look +hither,+ ye humble, and be cheered, | and trust in  
Yahwè<sup>1</sup> !

Thou hast multiplied thy lovingkindnesses, O Yahwè<sup>2</sup> ; |  
and thy purposes in our behalf ; 6

If I would declare and utter thy wonders, | they are too  
many to recount.

In sacrifices and offerings if thou didst delight, | fat ones  
would I choose me ; 7a, b

10 Burnt offerings and sin-offerings if thou didst demand, |  
surely I would bring them. 7c, 8a

In the wonderful things of thy purposes, | O my God !  
I delight, 8b, 9a(part).

That I may publish the awful deeds of thy righteousness |  
in thy habitation. 9

<sup>1</sup> Happy is the man that makes Yahwè his trust, and does not turn to vanities,  
nor fall away to lies. 5

<sup>2</sup> My God.

I have heralded [thy] righteous dealing,<sup>1</sup> O Yahwè ! | my  
lips I restrain not ; 10, 11

Thy lovingkindness and thy faithfulness I have not con-  
cealed | from the great assembly.

Thou too, O Yahwè ! restrain not | thy compassion from me, 12  
Thy lovingkindness and thy faithfulness, [O my God !] |  
let them guard me continually.

3. Cp. lxix. 3, 15 f. Even if M were correct we could not explain realistically from the history of Jeremiah (Jer. xxxviii. 6–13). The next line proves that the language is metaphorical; the story of Jeremiah says nothing about a rock. The 'pit' referred to is a figure for Sheol (so בּוֹר xxviii. 1, xxx. 4, &c.). The 'sea' (יָם, not יַיִן) is that which rolls above the world of the dead. מַיִת הַיּוֹן and בּוֹר שְׁאוֹן are names of two of the seven hells in the Talmud (*Erubin* 19a); cf. on lxxxviii. 12. The revival of Israel spoken of dates from the completion of the temple (B.C. 516); the psalmist idealizes, and only refers to present dangers in the last verse.

5. Yahwè's mercies are an inspiration to Israel; but cp. Isa. li. 16, lix. 21. A new song; see on xxxiii. 3.—6. See introd., and cp. lxix. 33 (corr. text). *Purposes*; cp. xxxiii. 11, xcii. 5; Isa. lv. 8 f.

7 f. Cp. lxxxix. 2; Isa. lxiii. 7, and (l. 8) cxxxix. 18 f. The omission of v. 5 (cp. Jer. xvii. 7) as an individualistic application (see crit. n.) heightens the effect. Smend, however (*ZATW*, viii. [88] 108), regards v. 6 as the

explanation of v. 5; the 'man' who is there congratulated is the community, as xciv. 12. For הַבְּלִים and כּוֹב cp. xxxi. 7. Idol-worship is referred to; cp. Am. ii. 4 (בָּזֶבֶד).

9. The 'sacrifices and offerings' spoken of seem to be (or to include) thank-offerings; but in l. 10 we read of propitiatory 'burnt-offerings and sin-offerings.' The psalmist implies that there were many Jews who conceived sacrifices of either class to be well-pleasing to God; but he holds, with Jeremiah and other psalmists, that God is, not indeed hostile, but at least indifferent to them (see introd.).

here only, = הַטָּאֵת, G [τδ] περὶ ἄτ  
τῆς, recognizing no distinction between  
הַטָּאֵת (or הַטָּאֵת) and אֲשֶׁם. On  
the archaeological points, see 'Sacrifice,' *Enc. Brit.*

12. Cp. xxvi. 7. נִוְרָאוֹת; see especially lxv. 6, cxlv. 6.—13 f. Cp. xxii. 23; lxxi. 15 (corr. text).

16. Cp. xxv. 21, xlii. 3, lxi. 8; also (יִצְרוֹנִי) xxv. 21, lxi. 8; cp. xxiii. 6.

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. Insert אֱלֹהֵי שְׁוֹעֵתִי.—3. M Read שׁוֹעָה in accordance with usage (Gr.).—M הַיּוֹן יַיִן is inexplicable (see *BDB*). Read הַיָּם, and cp. Job xli. 22 f., where מַיִת and יָם occur near together.—6. M יִרְאָה and יִרְאָה, for which Du. compares Isa. xli. 5. Parallelism requires רָאִי and נִהְרֶה (S vaguely 'shall rejoice'), and, for M's רַבִּים, עֲנִיִּים; cp. lxix. 33 (corr. text), and (נָהַר) xxxiv. 6. For וַיִּבְטְחוּ read וַיִּבְטְחוּ.

Ver. 5, with its individualistic application (cp. xxxii. 1, 2) is a later

<sup>1</sup> In the great assembly.

insertion. Two errors may be noted. M's רַהֲבִים is inexplicable; a mythological term (as if 'Rahabs,' Gunkel, *Sch.* 40) is surely quite out of place here. Read הַבָּלִים (xxx. 7) with Giesebr., *Gött. gel. Anz.*, Aug., '95, p. 40; G *ματαιότηας*.—M שְׁמִי. Read יְשֻׁמָּה אֶל־; so in the main Gunkel; note parallelism.

7 f. M רַבּוֹת עֲשִׂית אַתָּה יְהוָה. The last two words are enclosed by Paseks, but the whole clause is in a bad form. Du. would simply omit אַתָּה, but his justification is too far-fetched. Omit אַתָּה \*as a corrupt fragment of a dittographed עֲשִׂית [ה] and יְהוָה as a gloss on אֱלֹהֵי; and read הַרְבֵּית חֲסִדֶּיךָ. In a context like this חֲסִדִּים is essential. Transfer נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ to line 8, as a substitute for the miswritten אֵין עַד אֵלֶיךָ (an editorial 'correction' of a *miswritten* נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ; note Pasek).

9 f. For לֹא read לֹא=לִי; for אֲזִנִּים read שְׁמִנִּים (so, in 1 S. xv. 9, We., Gr., Bu. read for (מִשְׁנִים), and for כְּרִית read either בְּרוֹתִי (with Gr.) or בְּחִרְתִּי. G's *κατατίσω* suggests בְּרִאת; but 'ears hast thou created for me' would only be tolerable if in the parallel half-line we were to read something like לִבִּי חֲדָשְׁתָּ. But a more probable view of the stanza can be obtained. G's *σῶμα* (not to be altered into *ῥῶμα*, which is given by 'A Σ Θ) represents עֶצֶם; now עֶצֶם can in a badly written MS. be confounded with שֶׁן. (Gr. arrives at שְׁמִנִּים somewhat differently.)—For אֲזִנִּי הִנֵּה בְּאֵתִי read אֲזִנִּי הִנֵּה בְּאֵתִי. Gr. keeps 'אֲזִנִּי, and corrects בְּאֵתִי. But 'אֲזִנִּי must certainly be cancelled. These words are a variant to אֲזִנִּים כְּרִית לִי, as We. rather obscurely indicates. [Du. agrees.]

11 f. M במִּגְלַת סֵפֶר כְּתוּב עֲלַי, which We. connects with 'אֲזִנִּי, rendering 'Mine ears hast thou opened by means of the book of the Law prescribed to me,' as if the psalmist meant that he found nourishment for his purified religious views in the sacred book of his people. The objection to this is threefold. 1, it implies the correctness of 'אֲזִנִּי; 2, it gives an unmetrical and prosaic sentence; and 3, the sense produced is not natural. Ol. and Abbott offer a different hypothesis. They regard the above words as a marginal note<sup>1</sup> either on רְצוֹנְךָ (so Ol.), or on לִי in כְּרִית לִי (so Abbott, who interprets, 'In a manuscript is written 'עֲלַי'; similarly Bruston in *Du texte primitif des Psaumes*, '73, p. 109; cp. *ZATW*, '97, pp. 193 f.). The form of the marginal note does not seem to me natural, and in any case such a hypothesis is only permissible as a last resource. Having regard to similar textual phenomena elsewhere,

<sup>1</sup> Duhm, too, finds a marginal note—'Behold, I have read it (בִּינִיתִי) in a roll of a book copied out for me'; an allusion to Jer. vii. 21 ff., &c.

should we not read בְּנִפְלְאוֹת מַחֲשַׁבְתֶּיךָ אֱלֹהִי? Thus we get a point of contact with *l.* 7 which is of the utmost value for the ideal unity of the psalm. אֱלֹהִי underlies M's עָלִי (cp. on xlii. 7); the verb which is required to complete the clause is חִפְצָתִי, which in M is separated from עָלִי, *i.e.* אֱלֹהִי, by רְצוֹנָךְ אֱלֹהִי. What is the genesis of these last-quoted words?—אֱלֹהִי, of course, is an early editor's correction of עָלִי. The two remaining words must be combined with בתוך בתוך מעי, which, now that this seeming parallel has been transformed, we see cannot be right (indeed, בתוך מעי ought of itself to have awakened suspicions). One of the words to be accounted for ought of course to be a parallel to נִפְלְאוֹת; we may probably find it in וְתוֹרַתְךָ, for which read נִרְאוֹת (see on xlv. 5*b*). בתוך מעי is to be explained on the analogy of סֵפֶר כְּתוֹב; read בְּמִשְׁכְּנֶיךָ (cp. on xxvi. 6, 8). רְצוֹנָךְ has arisen partly by transposition, partly by corruption of letters. The whole line should run—בְּמִשְׁכְּנֶיךָ נִרְאוֹת צִדְקֶךָ | בְּמִשְׁכְּנֶיךָ.

13. M צִדְקָה; read צִדְקָתְךָ (Bi. צִדְקָה); note Pasek, and see *v.* 11 (*ad init.*). M G insert בְּקֶהֱלָךְ רַב.—For הִנֵּה read יְהוָה.—16*a*. Insert אֱלֹהִי (metre).

Verses 10, 11 contain a number of miswritten dittograms and variants. יָדַעַת and perhaps, too, its complement אַתָּה come from a mutilated צִדְקָתְךָ, and 'צִד' itself is a correction of צִדְקָה in *v.* 10. לֹא־כִסִּיתִי is a variant to לֹא־כִהַדְתִּי לְבִי. בְּתוֹךְ לְבִי comes, through editorial skill, from a miswritten variant בְּקֶהֱלָךְ רַב. אֲמוֹנֶתְךָ וְחֶסֶדְךָ (so read) is a variant to חֶסֶדְךָ וְאֲמוֹנֶתְךָ.

## PSALM XL.—2.

**PENTAMETERS.** A fragment of a psalm of complaint and supplication, which may have been added in dark days as an appendix to the preceding psalm, to tone down its apparently too optimistic contents. It is separated from this psalm by a passage condensed from xviii. 5, lxix. 2-5, which can hardly be in its original state, and may perhaps have been nearly as follows:—

For floods of Deathland snatch me away | without number,  
Jerahmeelites and Mişrites, | Zarephathites and Arabians.

We are thus delivered from the exaggerated description of the sins and calamities of the speaker, and the passage is brought into line with many others. סְפוּנִי לְרִאוֹת, יִרְחַמְאִלִים for וְלֹא־יִכְלֵתִי, עָלִי רָעוֹת for שְׁבַלֵּי מוֹת, אֲפַפּוּ for מִשְׁעֵרוֹת, עֲמַלְק (?) for עֲצָמוֹ, and לְבִי for the same word repeated, מִצּוֹר for רֹאשִׁי, עֲרִבִים for עֲזָבִנִי, and מִצּוֹר for רֹאשִׁי, are all possible and partly even probable errors (cp. lxix., lines 1-12). The psalm-fragment appears again as Ps. lxx., where the title (rightly read) assigns it to 'the Ethanite.' Lines 2 and 3 are parallel to xxxv. 4, 21, 26.

*Critical Notes.* 1, 3. Omit יהוה and לְסִפּוֹתָהּ (metre). For יִבְשׁוּ read יִשְׁבּוּ (vi. 11); parallelism.—4. M בְּשִׁתָּם. Read שְׂמַחְתָּם (Gr.); cp. Ezek. xxxv. 15. The ב in בְּשִׁתָּם is dittographed from עֲקֵב. Omit לִי, which does not suit הָאֵחָ, and is wanting in xxxv. 21, 25 (Hu., Bi., Du.).

6. אֶהְיֶה is not quite right, either as a parallel to מִבְּקִשִּׁי or as connected with 'תֵּשׁ. Read תֵּהְיֶה; cp. cxix. 174, and continue יִשְׁוֹעַתְךָ (ת comes from תֵּאבִי).

7. M יחשב. Read חוֹשֶׁה (lxx. 6); so Gr. The idea of God's providence would have received more elaboration.

## PSALM XLI.

**TETRAMETERS.** The people of Israel is likened to a man who is dangerously sick, and whose sore disease is taken by malicious neighbours as a proof that he is forsaken by God. The sufferer makes his plaint to God, who will save him even in this almost desperate condition. *V.* 13 contains a reference to the Messianic blessedness of Israel.

The psalm has received a liturgical preface from an editor (the editor of Book I.?), to adapt this psalm, or so much of it as he retained, or as had come down to him, to the wants of his own age. The connexion between the preface and the psalm has been variously interpreted. If we adhere to M, we must either suppose the congratulation of *vv.* 2 ff. to be addressed to the *foreigner* who takes notice of helpless Israel (cp. Smend, *ZATW*, iv. 173), or suppose them to contain a generalizing inference from the fact that the speaker of *vv.* 5 ff. has himself been relieved in dire distress (Coblenz, 146). If, however, we adopt the corrected text, all becomes plain. *Vv.* 2–5 are parallel, not so much to xxxii. 1 f. as to xci., which most probably describes the security of the pious and believing community. However much Israel may be tried, he has an indestructible inward happiness, based upon his piety. The psalm is parallel to Pss. vi., xxxv., xxxviii., &c., in which the speaker is certainly the community; for *v.* 10 see also on lv. 13–15. Observe that in *v.* 6b the disappearance of the *name* of the speaker is hoped for; this suits the view here maintained much better than the view that some individual is intended, for on the latter theory we should expect to see a reference to the *posterity* of the speaker (cp. Smend, 111). Besides in *v.* 6a (the correction is certain) there is a point of contact with lxxxiii. 4. The parallelism between *v.* 9 (see note on l. 15) and the story of Job is remarkable. Job's sickness was, to some readers at any rate (see Job xlii. 12, and cp. Isa. lxi. 7), a type of Israel's undeserved calamity. Duhm finds in the psalm a most unpleasing picture of the internal condition of the Jewish community; but this is because, like B. Jacob, he supposes the speaker to be an individual. As to the date of the psalm, it cannot be remote from that of lv. 13–15 and lxxxiii.

*Deposited. Marked: Of Arab-ethan.*

1

(*Liturgical Preface.*)

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Happy is he who makes the Most High his confidence ! | 2 |
|   | In the day of trouble Yahwè will deliver him.        |   |
|   | Yahwè will guard him and revive him ;                | 3 |
|   | To the greed of his foes He cannot surrender him.    | . |
|   | On his bed of sickness Yahwè will support him ;      | 4 |
|   | His wailing +God+ will change for him into dancing.  |   |

*(Incomplete Psalm.)*

- [Unto thee do I call,] O Yahwè, revive me ; 5  
 Heal my soul, for unto thee do I sigh.  
 Mine enemies make a wily plot against me, 6  
 10 ' O that he might die and his name vanish ' !  
 They come to behold, they speak falsehood, 7  
 Against me they imagine evil.  
 They go abroad, they spread slander, 8  
 My haters whisper against me in unison—  
 ' He has spread his bed in Sheol, 9  
 From the couch of his bed he will arise no more.'  
 Even my friend takes pleasure in my stripes, 10  
 My guest mocks at my wounds.  
 But thou, O Yahwè, revive me, and raise me up, 11  
 20 [And avenge me,] and give them their due !  
 By this I shall know that thou hast pleasure in me— 12  
 That mine enemy does not triumph over me.  
 As for me, thou holdest me up continually, 13  
 And causest me to stand in thy presence for ever.

*Doxology.*

- Blessed be Yahwè, Israel's God, 14  
 From the age +of the past+ to the age +of the future.  
 Amen, Amen.

2-5. See introd.—4. **אֱלֹהֵינוּ**, **אל** expresses the strong personal interest of the speaker. Surely God cannot deliver up Israel to his foes. Cp. xxvii. 12, lxxiv. 19.—6. Cp. xxx. 12.

8 ff. There is no confession of sin here ; the speaker takes up the attitude of Job. ' Healing ' is asked because of the soreness of Israel's calamity (cp. vi. 3 f., xxxi. 10 f.). Israel's ' sighing ' is not ' hid from ' God (xxxviii. 10). *LL* 9 f. must be explained by lxxxiii. (see above). The *enemies* are the neighbouring populations of Palestine, certainly not Jews who were hostile to the writer (Duhm).

11 f. The power of the ' enemies ' is restricted ; evidently there is a higher power, the Persian, which they can best

bring over to their side by slandering the Jerusalem community (cp. xxxviii. 13). The imaginary visit spoken of is not one of condolence but of malicious gazing (cp. xxii. 8, xxxviii. 21 f.). *Evil*, i.e. calamity.

15. **He has spread his bed**, &c. Israel, like Job, is to all appearance at the point of death. Correction of the text of *LL* 15 f. not only produces a perfect parallelism, but improves the connexion between the psalm and the preface. See crit. n.

17 f. The cruellest pang of all comes from a treacherous friend. It is doubted whether the party of unfaithful, worldly-minded Jews, or some neighbouring people (*Bä.* suggests the Edomites) is meant. The former view is preferable : (1) It accounts best for the phrase **אוכל לחמי** ; (2) it is favoured by



the || passage, lv. 13-15; (3) it explains the separate mention of the offence referred to. Of course, the 'friend' (lit., 'man of my friendship') is a collective personality, like the speaker, and like the 'enemy' in *l.* 22 (cp. *l.* 9); see Ob. 7; Jer. xx. 10, xxxviii. 22. *Has eaten my bread*, i.e. has enjoyed my hospitality. The worldly-minded Jews referred to had in times past gone in and out among their brethren, receiving the ordinary kindnesses of daily life. Cp. on *lxix.* 9.

20. M has, 'Raise me up again that I may give them their due,' which

Bishop Perowne naturally finds offensive, and which Bā, unhappily illustrates by M's text of cxxxvii. 8 f. Contrast Dt. xxxii. 35; Isa. xxxv. 4.

21. בּוֹאֵת יֵדְעֵתִי, 'ex hoc cognoverim.'

23 f. **Upholdest**, as xxxvii. 24; continually, as lxxiii. 23; in thy presence, cp. xi. 7, xvi. 11, xvii. 15.

25 f. Cp. the doxologies after lxxii., lxxxix., cvi. Probably such formulæ were used in the liturgy at the end of every psalm that was sung (cp. Neh. ix. 5).

*Critical Notes.* 2. M מִשְׁכִּיל אֶלְדֵּל; G ὁ συνῶν ἐπὶ πῖσιν καὶ i.e. מ' אֶלְדֵּל וּבִינִי; so Gr., Bi., Ley, Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Du. The difficulty of the sense (see introd.) is an objection to this. Read הִשָּׁם עָלָיו מִחֲסֵהוּ. The first step in corruption was the transposition of עַל and מִחֲ, Then הִשָּׁם fell out through its likeness to מִחֲסֵ. The suffix הוּ was indicated by a mark of abbreviation. Then the עַל in עָלָיו was repeated thrice as יַל, אַל, and דַּל. It was natural that עָלָיו should now be conjecturally corrected into אֲבִיו.

3 f. A variant יֵאֲשְׁרֵהוּ (for יִשְׁמְרֵהוּ) is half concealed in M's superfluous יֵאֲשֶׁר בְּאֶרֶץ (Kr. וְאֵשֶׁר). G μακαρίσαι αὐτόν; T יוֹמִיבִינִיָּה. Similarly Herz.—תִּתְּנֵהוּ should be יִתְּנֵהוּ (G Σ S, Gr.). The address to Yahwè comes later.

5 f. M דּוּי כָּל. The supposed noun דּוּי in Job vi. 7 is corrupt (see Beer *ad loc.*). דּוּי means 'sick,' thrice, and always with כָּל. כל וּי belong together; ד is intrusive. Read חָלָיו.—M מִשְׁנֵבּוּ הַפֶּנֶת. With Gr. read חָלָיו.—M מִסְפָּרוֹ יִהְיֶה לְמַחֹל; most awkward. Cp. xxx. 12, and read לְמַחֹל.

7 f. M G begin אֲנִי אִמְרֵתִי, probably an editorial alteration. The original may have had לֵךְ קִרְאֵתִי. Assume this, and *ll.* 7 f. become quite parallel.—M חֲנִנִי. With Gr. read חֲנִי (l. 3; vi. 3); so *l.* 19.—M G לֵךְ חֲמַתִּי; surely not the true ground of the complaint (see note above). Read probably לֵךְ נִאֲנַחֲתִי (cp. vi. 7, xxxviii. 10).

9 f. M יֵאֲמְרוּ רַע לִי. Read יַעֲרִימוּ סָר עָלַי (lxxxiii. 4). Transposition and corruption of letters.—M מְתֵי יָמוֹת. מְתֵי is an incorrectly written יָמוֹת; it has supplanted לֵךְ 'O that,' which fell out after לִי. So virtually Herz.

11 f. M וְאִם-בָּא וְאִם weakens the effect. Read בָּאָה, and afterwards יִדְבְּרֵי.—M יִקְבֹּץ. Read יִחַשֵּׁב; M gives לִי רַעָה לִי at end of v. 8; it is a variant to our *l.* 18.

15 f. M בְּלִיעַל דָּבָר; so again in M in ci. 3. Does it mean moral or physical evil? G, λόγον παράνομον; but most explain 'a sore disease.' Lag. would read, 'דָּבָר ב'; cp. דָּבָר הוּת, xci. 3. But xci. 3 needs correction (see *ad loco*); and plausible as it may seem to render 'ב' 'an incurable plague,' and to see an allusion to an etymology of ('no coming up' = 'no cure'), the improbability of יצוק בו (which follows), and the want of a fit parallel for l. 16 bid us look more closely into the text. No doubt we should read, comparing cxxxix. 9 and especially Job xvii. 13 (יְצוּעִיו) מִשָּׁפָּבּוּ, and in the next line, for the very poor וְאִשֶּׁר שָׁכַב, we should read מִיַּעֲרֵשׁ מִשָּׁפָּבּוּ. Cp. עַל-עֲרֵשׁ יְצוּעִי cxxxii. 3.

17. M אִישׁ שְׁלוּמִי אֲשֶׁר-בִּטַּחְתִּי בו, a poor paraphrase of לל. 17 and 18 must be taken together. הַגְדִּיל עָלַי עֶקֶב (G ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμέ πτερνισμών; cp. 2 K. x. 9) is impossible. הַגְדִּיל always means 'to act proudly.' Hence We. suggests taking עֶקֶב adverbially like יַעֲקֹב. But such an appendage is not required, either for sense or for metre. Du. would transfer עֶקֶב (עֶקֶב 'reward') to the end of the next line but one. But clearly הַגְדִּיל should be הִלְעִיג (as xxxv. 26, xxxviii. 17, lv. 13), and עֶקֶב comes from לִמְכָּאֲבִי (כ, ע, and ק confounded). Then it becomes plain how the second half of l. 17 should run,-

19. M הִינֵנִי. With Gr., read הִינֵנִי (see on l. 7 f.).—After הִקִּימֵנִי insert וְהִנֵּקְם-לִי (Jer. xv. 15), which very easily fell out.—M אֲשֶׁלְמָה. Read probably וְשִׁלְמָה (Gr.). The alternative is to read ———

23. M בְּתַמִּי. If correct, this is the first reference to the speaker's integrity. The reference would hardly have been isolated, and it is not favoured by the || line. תָּמִיד suggests לְעוֹלָם, a rather favourite word of the psalmists in such a connection (see xvi. 8, xl. 12, lxxiii. 23).

## BOOK II.

## PSALMS XLII. AND XLIII.

**PENTAMETERS.** In feeling this is surpassed by none of the Temple-psalms, in perfection of form it is equalled by few. To make the right number of psalms it was broken into two parts; but the identity of subject, metre, and refrain, the interlacing repetitions, and the want of a heading to Ps. xliii., combine to prove that xlii. and xliii. formed originally a single psalm. The setting of historical circumstance in the psalm seems to be purely imaginary. The poet thinks himself back into the period which followed the great catastrophe, when the Edomites were establishing themselves by degrees in the Negeb (southland) of Judah, and displayed undying animosity to their Jewish kinsfolk. The Edomites are called here Jerahmeelites, partly from a love of archaism (see on lxxxiii.), partly because the large district formerly occupied by the Jerahmeelites was passing into the possession of the Edomites, who, for their part, were forced to this migration by the conquest of Seir by the Nabatæans.<sup>1</sup> Pss. lxiii., cxx., cxxxvii., cxl., are exactly parallel. In cxxxvii. and hardly less certainly in lxiii. the speaker (*i.e.* in cxxxvii. a band of temple-singers) imagines himself to have been carried captive into the Jerahmeelite (*i.e.* Edomite) region to the S. of Judæa, where Yahwē was not acknowledged. In Pss. cx., cxl. the speaker (the Jewish community) is in his own home, but his happiness is marred by the neighbourhood of the treacherous Jerahmeelites and Arabians, who are ever seeking to entangle the Jews in strife (cp. xlii. l. 16). All these three psalms express vindictive feelings; Ps. xlii. in this respect pleasingly contrasts with them. The speaker (*i.e.* a company of Jews dwelling among Jerahmeelite oppressors) only craves the divine guardianship and restoration to the house of God. Cp. on Ps. lxi.

It is obviously unnecessary to discuss theories of the occasion of our psalm which presuppose an uncorrected, or an imperfectly corrected, text. Ewald held that the psalm was the melodious farewell of the royal exile Jehoiachin, as in B.C. 597 he was being carried away beyond the ridge of Hermon. J. P. Peters considered the basis of the poem to be a psalm of the old temple of Dan (*New World*, June '93, p. 103). Hitzig (followed in 1891 by the present writer, *OP*, 114 f.) ascribed the psalm to a Jew taken captive by Scopas, an Ætolian mercenary in the service of Egypt, and delivered by Antiochus the Great on his victory over Scopas at the sources of the Jordan. Hitzig (followed by Duhm) even names the writer; he was the high priest Onías III., who suffered enough from 'men of guile and injustice' (xliii. 1, in M), and who would, of course, be prominent in processions to the temple (Hitzig, but not Duhm, retains אֲדָרִים in xlii. 5). All these theories, however ingenious, have to be abandoned.

As to phraseological points of contact with other poems, some, *e.g.* that supposed to exist in xlii. 7 (וְהָר מְצֹעַר), 'thou little mountain,' according to Hitzig and *OP* 115, 317), compared with lxviii. 16 f., and in xlii. 7, 8, compared with Jer. ii. 4, 8, disappear, as a result of textual emendation. But one of the most interesting parallels remains, cp. xlii. 5, 9, xliii. 3 with lvii. 4. Fresh parallels

<sup>1</sup> See *Introd. to Bk. of Isaiah*, 210 f., with the literature there cited; Torrey, *JBL*, '98, pp. 16-20; Cheyne, *ib.*, 207 f.

now appear between xlii. 8*a* and lxxxiii. 4, cxl. 3 ; between *v.* 8*b* and lxix. 10*b* ; and between *v.* 10, xliii. 2 and xlv. 25. Psalms xxvii. (note *v.* 13), lxi., lxiii., and lxxxiv. will also naturally be compared.

According to Roy (49 f.), Pss. xlii., xliii., lxi., lxiii., and lxxxiv. were produced by Jews of the Dispersion, who longed to become pilgrims to Jerusalem. This view is plausible, but hardly necessary. Many pious Jews of Palestine might, in difficult times, be prevented from resorting to the temple, and it is generally presupposed in the Psalter that visits to the temple are for the purpose of thanksgiving for national mercies.

*Deposited. Of the sons of Korah.*

1

- 1 Even as the hind crieth in pain | towards running streams, 2  
 So in pain my soul crieth | toward thee, O Yahwè !  
 Thirsty is my soul for Yahwè, | for the God of my life ; 3  
 When shall I go in and behold | the face of Yahwè ?  
 My tears have been to me ~~as~~ food | by day and by night, 4  
 While they say to me continually, | Where is thy God ?  
 Send forth thy lovingkindness, and thy faithfulness, | O  
 Yahwè, let them lead me, 5  
 Let them bring me in the midst of the singers | to the house  
 of God,  
 With ringing cries of thanksgiving, | the jubilation of  
 keepers of the feast.
- 10 Why faintest thou, my soul ? | why frettest thou within me ? 6  
 Wait on for Yahwè, that he may cause me to see | the  
 habitation of God.

Preserve me, [O Yahwè] my God, | from the tribe of the  
 Arabians, 7  
 From the race of the Jerahmeelites | rescue thou me.  
 Rouse thee, O God of my succour ; | why dost thou forget  
 me, 10  
 While I walk tremblingly, | the Arabians pressing me hard ?  
 They stir up wars continually | to consume thy guarded ones ; 8  
 The mockeries of those that insult thee— | upon me have  
 they passed.

As with arrows in my bones | the Misrites insult me, 11  
 While they say to me continually, | Where is thy God ?

20 O Yahwè ! command thy lovingkindness, | and send forth  
 thy faithfulness. 9  
 Why faintest thou, my soul ? | why frettest thou within me ? 12  
 Wait on for Yahwè, that he may cause me to see | the  
 habitation of God.

Preserve me, [O Yahwè] my God, | from the people of the  
 Arabians, xliii. 1  
 From the race of the Jerahmeelites | grant me to escape,  
 Awake, O God, my stronghold ; | why dost thou spurn me, 2  
 While I walk tremblingly, | the Arabians pressing me hard ?  
 [While they say to me continually, | Where is thy God ?]  
 Send forth thy lovingkindness and thy faithfulness, | O  
 Yahwè, let them lead me, 3  
 Let them bring me to thy holy mountain, | to thy habitation;  
 30 Then will I go in to the altar of Yahwè, | to the God my  
 redeemer, 4  
 And will chant hymns to thee and thank thee on 'the  
 lyre, | O Yahwè my God.  
 Why faintest thou, my soul ? | why fallest thou within me ?  
 Wait on for Yahwè, that he may cause me to see | the  
 habitation of God.

2-7. Debarred from attendance at the festival services of the temple, the speaker has a keen inward pain like that of the hind in the hot summer-time when the ordinary water-courses are dry. Communion with God is more to him than meat and drink ; this is the boon which fully justifies the title applied to Yahwè of 'God of my life' (cp. on lxxxiv. 3). At present, however, the stimulating sympathy of fellow-worshippers is exchanged for the derisive cries of unbelieving foreigners. But when God manifests himself as the Faithful One (expressed symbolically by 'Send forth thy lovingkindness,' &c.), all will be changed. Surrounded by the temple-singers, and led by invisible angels (חסד and אמת), he will once more move in procession to the sanctuary. Why then despond ? God will yet cause him to see His habitation ; wait His time.—2. נער. See crit. n., and cp. lxi. 3, lxxxiv. 3 (מִקְוֵי חַיִּים or אֵל חַיִּים?). Cp. מִקְוֵי חַיִּים, xxxvi. 10. Ben Sira (xxiii. 4) has 'Father and God of my life.'—3. אבנא 'go in,' viz. to the temple.—6. Where is thy God ? The words are most forcible if we suppose the speaker to be a captive in a strange land.—7. On personification of attributes, see OP, 322, 334, and cp. lvii. 4.—9. דמון of music, as Am. v. 23, Ezek. xxvi. 13.

12-22. Here the poet enters more into detail, both naming and describing the oppressors.—*Arabians*, i.e. N. Arabians. Cp. Lam. v. (on the text, see 'Lamentations, Book of,' *Enc. Bib.*), Neh. ii. 19, iv. 7 [1], vi. 1.—*Jerahmeelites*. See introd., and cp. 'Amalek,' lxxxiii. 8. Observe that in 2 K. xxiv. 2 we should probably read, 'the bands of the Cushites, and of the Aramites, and of the Misrim (people of Musri), and of the bnē Amalek.' Cp. on Pss. lxxiv., lxxxiii.

16. Cp. lxxxiii. 4, cxi. 3, and especially cxx. 5-7.—17. Cp. lxi. 10.—18. *Thy guarded ones* = thy remnant. Cp. Isa. xlix. 6 (נְצוּרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל).

23-33. The same petitions and descriptions as before, but with fuller details of the expected happy return. Then the speaker will resume his lyre ; he could not sing 'songs of Yahwè on foreign ground' (cxxxvii. 4). Theodoret has already made this remark ; he thinks that the psalmist assumed prophetically the standpoint of the Babylonian exile.—25. וְנָח. Again, in xlv. 10, 24, lx. 3, 12 (cviii. 12), lxxiv. 1, lxxvii. 1, lxxxviii. 15, lxxxix. 39, Lam. ii. 7, iii. 17, 31. Though also found in Hos. viii. 3, 5, Zech. x. 6, it is specially a psalmist's word. On usage, see crit. n. on xlv. (2), l. 1.

*Critical Notes.* For אלהים read יהוה, almost throughout (see General Introd.).

1. M כִּאֵיל. Read כאילת (Ol., Bö., Bi., Sta., Che., We., Du.). ת follows.—M תַּעֲרֵנָּה. G ἐπιποθεῖ; cp. T מִרְנָה (see on lxxxiv. 2). Σ σπεύδει ('A ὡς αὐλὼν πεπρασιασμένος); cp. S' and J ('sicut areola,' &c., as if עֲרוֹנָה, 'areola'). S, however, מִיֵּי, 'mugiens.' This sense is required by Joel i. 20 (תַּעֲרוֹנָה, of cattle); the same word may be used of a stag and of cattle (Bochart). In Joel the vss. again differ; G ἀνέβλεψαν, T מִסְבָּרָא, 'A ἐπρασιώθη, J suspexerunt. J comments thus, 'quasi areola sitiens imbrem. Hoc enim uno verbo significat Aq., dicens 'έπρας.' S as in Ps. Rödiger (Ges. *Thes.*) admits that 'mugiens' is plausible, but prefers 'desiderans' because עֲרֵנָּה can thus be connected with עֲרוֹנָה. But עֲרוֹנָה, if a genuine word, comes from עֲרַן, 'to ascend' (so the Lexicons). If genuine, I say, because such a root is very doubtful, and how can עֲרוֹנָה really mean 'a flower-bed in the form of a terrace' (see *JQR* xii. 380. on Cant. v. 13)? At any rate, we need not be exercised about תַּעֲרֵנָּה. Transposition makes all plain. Read, with Herz, תַּנְעֵר. נַעַר is, no doubt, commonly used of the divine rebuke or threat, but even here the original sense of 'cry' pierces through; and besides the Ethiopic cognate, we have Ar. حَار (see Ges.), 'mugivit, altā voce rogavit, supplicavit cum gemitu et planctu' (*Koran*, Sur. xxiii. 6). See on the parallel passages, lxi. 3. lxxxiv. 3.—M עֵל. Read אֵל. The confusion is frequent.

3 f. M לֵאלֹהֵי; so lxxxiv. 3 (but see note), cp. Josh. iii. 10, Hos. ii. 16. Read, with Duhm, לֵחַי, metre improved and sense fuller.—M אֶרְאָה; so G J. But S T, and some MSS. and edd., אֶרְאָה. So rightly Bā., We., Du. See on lxxxiv. 8, and *SBOT* on Isa. i. 12.

6. M בְּאִמָּר. Read בְּאִמָּרִם (v. 11); so Kenn., Ol., Bi., Gr.; cp. S.

7. (From אֵלֶּה to נִפְשֵׁי). The two *Paseks* warn us of uncertainty. Note first the impossibility of אֲשַׁכַּח עָלַי. Elsewhere the phrase (נִפְשֵׁי לִבִּי, שִׁיחִי) שֶׁפֶּה נִפְשֵׁי is followed by 'לפני י', not by עָלַי (see lxii. 9, cii. 1, cxlii. 3, 1 S. i. 15, Lam. ii. 19). אֵלֶּה אֲזַכֵּר is also very awkward. The doubts of scholars as to the rendering of the cohortative (see Hitz.; Driver, *Tenses*, § 51 f.) were very natural; editorial makeshifts are, of course, often very difficult to render. For a makeshift the reading before us certainly is. The true reading will appear through the manipulated text as soon as we have noticed the plan of interlacing the strophes by repeating certain passages (not only the refrain) either in the same or in a varied form. It is this, יִבְיֵאוּנִי [יהוה] !

This approaches the traditional and agrees with the corrected text of xliii. 3a; it also approaches in some degree the corrected text of xlii. 9.

(From **אֱלֹהִים** to **פִּי אֶעֱבֹר**). Again notice Pasek. Read probably **יְבִיאֹנִי בְּתוֹךְ מְשֻׁרְרִים אֱלֹהִים**. This differs from xliii. 3b except in the first word; the sense in part agrees, in part it is fuller. We should never have guessed **בְּתוֹךְ מְשֻׁרְרִים**; the general sense is suggested by l. 9, and the form by the necessity of finding a phrase out of which M's **בְּסֶךְ אֲדֹרֵם** might have become corrupted. Let us now consider this strange expression. It is at once clear that **אֲדֹרֵם** (Bä. Kau. אֲדֹרֵם, cp. 'A, *προβιβάζων αὐτούς*) is a mere editorial guess, like אֲדֹרֵה in Isa. xxxviii. 15 (see *SBOT, Isa.*). **דָּדָה** *sensim* *ducere* is no doubt a late colloquial word (see Levy). G, *ὅτι διελύσονται ἐν τόπῳ σκηῆς θαυμαστῆς* (= **אֲדִיר**, so G in viii. 1, xcii. 6; Θ in xv. 3, lxxv. 5); from G and a few MSS., Kenn. and Bp. Horsley derive the reading **בְּסֶךְ אֲדִירִים**;<sup>1</sup> so too Bredenk. (*Gesetz u. Proph.* 143). But what does **סֶךְ** mean?<sup>2</sup> The present writer formerly (*Exp. Times*) proposed **בְּסֶדֶר אֲדֹרֵם** (cp. lv. 14 f.); after which he found that Gr. had suggested **בְּסֶדֶר מְשֻׁרְרִים**. Certainly **מְשֻׁרְרִים** is plausible; **בְּסֶדֶר** does not, however, go well with **מֵשׁ**. We must therefore try another explanation. Since **ת** and a sibilant may be confounded, and the context favours this, let us read **בְּתוֹךְ מֵשׁ** 'in the midst of the singers' (cp. lxviii. 26). Otherwise we might suspect **בְּסֶדֶר** to be a corruption of **קֶדֶשׁ**, and boldly adjust to xliii. 3b.—**אֱלֹהִים** is better than **עַד-בֵּית**. **עַד** comes from **עַל** (influenced by **אֲדֹרֵם**), and **עַל** from **אֵל**.

9. Read **הִמּוֹן** (G Σ; Gr. Du.). **חֹלֶנֶג** is a collective.—10. M **תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה**, with Pasek. The reduplicated form is improbable. xliv. 26 and Lam. iii. 20 might suggest **תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה**, but this would hardly have expanded so much. Read perhaps **מִהֲתַעֲמָפִי**; the changes are regular. Continue **וּמִהֲתַ** (v. 12; xliii. 5). So Kōn. § 366 n, after G Σ S J.

11. Duhm remarks that the distich containing the refrain has in each stichos one beat too many. But this is due to corruption of the text. **עוֹד** is clearly a dittogram, and so, less clearly perhaps, but not less certainly, in **פָּנִי**. Between these two words comes **יְשׁוּעוֹת**, each part of which phrase is questionable. The hope which sustains the

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Horsley's theology is not very critical; he considers **אֲדִירִים** to be a title of the **אֱלֹהִים**, 'the persons of the Godhead.'

<sup>2</sup> Dr. J. P. Peters (*JBL*, '93, p. 57), reading as above, finds a reference to the Feast of Booths.

speaker is too briefly expressed in the single word **אֹדְנֵנוּ**; not without exegetical reason did AV render, in *v.* 6, 'I shall yet praise him *for* the help of his countenance,' but (on grammatical grounds) with an alternative version, '... his presence is salvation,' suggested by G's version, alike in *ver.* 6 and in *ver.* 12 and xliii. 5, *σωτηρία μου ὁ θεός μου* (apparently this is the refrain of the anticipated thanksgiving). The right correction is that of Herz—**יִרְאֵנִי יֵשׁ** this scholar leaves; but the object of the verb should certainly be **מִשְׁפְּנוֹת אֱלֹהִים**. It is superfluous to attack **יִשְׁעוֹת פָּנֵי**; the critics who adopt this reading from xlii. 12, xliii. 5, would hardly do so except from textual conservatism. If **פָּנֵי** were correct, it would be combined with **נִשְׂאָה**. It was at any rate critical to re-attach **אֱלֹהֵי** [ן] to *v.* 6. But **פָּנֵי** is certainly a corruption of **ן**, a fragment of **כֹּשׁ**, and **עֲלֵהִי = אֱלֹהֵי**:

12 f. The text of MG is hard to translate and still harder to expound; the climax of unintelligibility, however, is reached in **מָהֵר מְצַעַר**. But we must remember that the O.T. is in many parts very much like a palimpsest. Underneath this extraordinary passage we may very probably see corrupt fragments of the following (cp. on *ll.* 23 f.):—

**שְׁמַרְנִי (יהודה) אֱלֹהֵי | מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת עַרְבִים**  
**מִזְרַע יִרְחָמָאֵלִים | [תְּפִלְמָנִי]**

The same distich, with one slight variation, and in a more complete form, appears as the opening distich of the third strophe according to our revised text. It is more easily recovered there, but it is certainly plausible to suppose that if **יִרְדֵּן וְהַרְמוֹנִים** in our passage is corrupt, and if some local or ethnic name is required, the best reading is **יִרְחָמָאֵלִים**. Now it can hardly be doubted that those two place-names (if **הַרְמוֹנִים** can be called a name at all) which are so strangely coupled *are* corrupt. What can 'the land of Jordan and the Hermonim' mean? 'The land of Jordan' should be equivalent to 'the land across Jordan.' But why should 'the Hermons' (?) be added? Even Delitzsch, who can plausibly explain 'the land of Jordan' by 2 S. xvii. 27 (David at Mahanaim), is obliged to put considerable pressure on 'the Hermonim' to extract a sense from it. That **מָהֵר מְצַעַר** is corrupt was seen long ago by Olshausen, but his ingenious correction **הָר מוֹעֵד** (also Gr.'s) is useless, because the passage is not adapted for superficial emendation. If, however, **יִרְחָ** is a correct restoration, we cannot doubt that **מָהֵר מְצַעַר** is a second attempt of the early editor to make sense of a corruption of these two words (**מִזְרַע = מְצַעַר**, and **יִרְחָ = יִרְחָם**), which has resulted in the omission of the verb **תְּפִלְמָנִי** (restored from xliii. 1). (It may be admitted that the correction **הָר מְצַעַר**, 'thou little mountain,' *i.e.* Zion [see introd.], is also plausible; but it is equally marked with superficiality, and the phrase is not in itself a natural one.)



It will be remarked that the unexpectedness of the names 'Arabians' and 'Jerahmeelites' led the scribe, in both cases, into dittography. **עֲרָבִים** is perhaps miswritten twice, as **עֲלִיכֶן** and as **אֲזַכְרְךָ**, and **יִרְחֻמְאֵלִים** certainly twice, as **יִרְדֵּן** and **חֲרָמוֹנִים**. For **נַפְשִׁי** = **שִׁמְרָנִי** cp. on xxv. 1, though the penultimate reading of the verb in *l.* 12 may have been **שִׁפְמָנִי** (cp. xliii. 1), in which case the initial **ת** in **תִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה** may belong properly to the same group of letters as **נַפְשִׁי** (**ט** for **ת**). That the initial **מ** in **מִמְשַׁפַּחַת** was lost is not surprising; when the same letter is repeated, one of the two often falls out. It is clear that the arrangement of this strophe (2) was disturbed. A regard for sense, and for the arrangement of str. 3 will enable us to remedy this.

14. M **אֹמְרָה** (with Pasek). xliii. 2 (*l.* 25) has **בְּיֶאֱתָהּ** (again Pasek). Both readings are corrupt; in *l.* 14 read **עֲוִירָה**, in *l.* 25, **הִקְצִינָה** (cp. xliv. 24).—M **לֵאֵל סִלְעִי**. The three **ל**s awaken suspicion. xliii. 2 (*l.* 25) has **אֱלֹהֵי מַעְוִי**. Read here **אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעִי** (xviii. 47, xxv. 5, xxxvii. 9). Cp. on *l.* 20.—15. **קָדַר**. Read **הִרְדַּר**; so too *l.* 26. Cp. on xxxviii. 7.—M **אֹיֵב**. Read, for consistency, **עֲרָבִי**; cp. vii. 6, xviii. 1, lxxiv. 3, 10.

16. M **תִּהְיוּ אֱלֹהִים קוֹיָא** (**תִּהְיוּ** masc.; see Albrecht, *ZATW*, xvi. 62). J 'abyssus abyssum invocat.' Fine; but the credit belongs to the editor. Unless *ll.* 14, 15 be excised as an editorial substitute for the true text, *ll.* 16, 17 cannot originally have agreed with the text of *v.* 8. A lover of vague but grand poetry may regret this. Read **מִלְחָמוֹת יִגְרִי** (cp. cxl. 36).—M **לִקְוֹל צִנּוֹרִיךָ**. What can **צִנּוֹר** mean? In 2 S. v. 8 it is perhaps a corruption of **צִיּוֹן** (see *Crit. Bib.*). Frd. Del. (*ProL.*, '86, 165 n.<sup>(1)</sup>) compares **טִנְפָא** (Tg., Talm.), 'stone, rock'; but most explain 'channel' from New Hebrew. G's *καταπρακτῶν* (Gen. vii. 11) is obscure. Read perhaps **נְצוֹרִיךָ לְכִלּוֹת**.

17. M **בְּלִשְׁבָּרִיךָ וּבְלִיךָ**. Three difficulties, 1. the tautology; 2. the extreme doubtfulness of **מִשְׁבָּרִים**, 'breakers' (see on xviii. 5); and 3. the connexion. Omitting **כָּל** as a dittogram, and assuming a transposition, I am compelled to read **לְעֵנִי מִחֲרָפִיךָ** (cp. lxix. 10b).

18. M **בִּרְצָה** (Pasek); '**ר**' here, as in Ezek. xxi. 27, is corrupt. Read **בְּהָצִים**; cp. lxiv. 3. A less easy and suitable correction is **בְּרָקֵב** (Ol., Gr., Che., Kau., Du.). Herz **בִּרְצִין** (or **בִּרְ**); G *ἐν τῷ καταθλάσθαι*.—M **צוֹרֵרִי**. Read **מִצָּרִים** (vi. 8).—M **אֹיֵב**. Read **עֲרָבִי**, restoring historical colour.

20. Evidently the text of *v.* 9 is in disorder (note two Paseks). Ol. and We. omit *v.* 9 as being unsuitable, and not required in a strophe of

'six verses.' But the metrical arrangement requires another line, and we expect a reference to Yahwè's חָסֶד and אֶמֶת as in the two other strophes (rightly read). Besides, *v.* 9 as it stands is too odd for an interpolator to have invented. Removing the dittographed accretions, and correcting gently, we get יוֹמָם יְהוָה יְהוּה חֶסֶדְךָ | וְשָׁלַח אֶמְתְּךָ is a corruption of a dittographed יְהוָה (suggested by בְּלִילָה); it is, however, the second יְהוּה which is superfluous. The י in יְהוּה comes from יְהוָה = י'. יְהוּה should be חֶסֶדְךָ, as in the other strophes. לִילָה comes from אֱלֹהִים (as in lxxvii. 3), a variant to, or correction of, יְהוּה. שִׁירָה comes from שָׁלַח, while עֲנִי תַפ is probably a corruption of אֶמְתְּךָ, and לָה is dittographed from לֹא in לֹאֵל חַי. לֹאֵל חַי is a variant to לֹאֵל סְלֵעִי (see on *l.* 14). The *δηλωσει* of the common text of G comes from *ῥῆγ' αὐτοῦ* (cod. A); so Brunś.

23 f. See on *ll.* 12 f. שְׁמַרְנִי should be רִיבֵי רִיבֵי מְנוֹי; שמרני comes from מְנוֹי עֲרָבִים. The traditional reading is hard to interpret; גִּי לֹא־חֶסֶד should mean the unfaithful section of the Jewish people in Palestine. But it is plain from xlii. 11, &c., that the enemies referred to are foreigners. We expect the ethnic name of the foreigners to be given. 'Hermonim' cannot be the name; surely לֹא־חֶסֶד can only come from יִרְחַמְאֵל[ים]; parallels are not scarce. And just as מְנוֹי follows the disguised עֲרָבִים, so מְזֹרַע in disguise follows יִרְחַמְאֵל though it may (strangely enough) with equal truth be said to precede it. The disguise of מְזֹרַע is מְאִישׁ; that of the dittographed יִרְחַמְאֵל is מְרֹמָה וְעוֹלָה.

25. For בִּי־אֶתָּה read הִקִּיצָה (ק and ת confounded). See on *l.* 14.—27. The line could not have been omitted, and it just completes the strophe.

26. M צוֹרֵרִי. Again read מְצָרִים cp. on lxxiv. 5.

28. M אֹרֶךְ. Read חֶסֶדְךָ (so *ll.* 7, 20); ח and א confounded, as often. Lag. ingeniously, אֹרֶךְ וְתַפִּיךָ, which might favour Duhm's hypothesis (?).—M הִפָּה. Read יְהוּה (*l.* 7).—M וַנְּחַוֶּנִּי. Some MSS. יִנְחַמּוּנִי (cp. on xxiii. 4).

30. M אֶל־אֵל שְׁמַחְתִּי אֲנִילָה. Duhm, אֶל־אֵל שְׁמַחְתִּי גִילִי. But 'אֵל ש' is not a probable phrase, nor is אֲנִילָה a synonym of אֹרֶךְ. Read אֶל־אֵל גִּילִי וְאֹרֶךְ.

#### PSALM XLIV.—I.

**T**RIMETERS. Probably the preface to a lost historical psalm; cp. lxxviii. The speaker is pious Israel (see on *v.* 5). Note point of contact with Ps. lvi. (note

on v. 9) and Ps. lxxx. (on v. 2). The division of Ps. xlv. into two parts is not only Bickell's; it was made independently in India by Rev. Jacob Thompson, *Psalms of the Sons of Korah*, Cottayam, Travancore, 1892, p. 16. Bickell has conjectured that between vv. 10–27 a leaf fell out, so that xlv.<sup>(1)</sup> lacks the end, and xlv.<sup>(2)</sup> the beginning. The hypothesis, however, implies what we can hardly assume, viz. that the MS. was written on leaves.

*Deposited. Of the sons of Korah. Deposited.*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    |  | 1 |
| 1  | O Yahwè! we have heard with attention,<br>Our fathers have recounted unto us,<br>The deeds thou didst perform in their days,<br>The works of thy hands in the days of old.   | 2 |
|    | ? [Thy people thou broughtest out of Egypt] ?<br>Nations didst thou drive out, and those didst thou plant in ;<br>? [And when their enemies oppressed them,] ?<br>Peoples didst thou shatter, and those didst thou rescue. | 3 |
| 10 | For not by their sword did they conquer the land,<br>Nor did their own arm bring them victory,<br>But thy right hand, and thine arm,<br>And the light of thy face, because thou favouredst them.                           | 4 |
|    | It is thou who art my King and my God,<br>The author of Jacob's victories :  | 5 |
|    | With thee can we butt our foes,<br>With thy name trample down our assailants.  | 6 |
|    | For it is not in my bow that I trust,<br>My sword cannot bring me victory ;  | 7 |
|    | It is thou that dost deliver us from our foes,   | 8 |
| 20 | And putttest those that hate us to shame.  |   |
|    | Continually we make our boast of thy name,<br>To the Most High we perform our vows.<br>[In thee we are fearlessly confident ;<br>What +indeed+ can earth's race do unto me ?]  | 9 |

*Conclusion lost.*

5 f. Cp. lxxviii. 55, lxxx. 9.—9, 17. Cp. xx. 8, xxxiii. 16, 1 S. xvii. 45.—11. The synonyms, as in lxxiv. 11, cp. Sirach xxxiii. 7.—12. *My king*, i.e. Israel's king, cp. l. 13, and see on v. 3.—14. *Jacob*, i.e. Israel. So lxxvi. 7, lxxxiv. 9, lxxxv. 2, lxxxvii. 2, but not

xxiv. 6 (see note).—15. *Can we butt*; for the metaphor, see Dt. xxxiii. 17, 1 K. xxii. 11, Dan. xi. 40.

16. **With thy name** = with thy Presence; cp. l. 21, and see 'Name,' *Enc. Bib.*—21. Cp. lvi. 11 (corr. text).

*Critical Notes.* 1-4. M אלהים. Read יהוה.—M : בימי קדם. Read מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיךָ בִּימֵי קָדֶם. Transposition of the two halves of the line; מ in מעשה overlooked, owing to the preceding מ.—Lines 6 and 8 gain in effect through being viewed as the second lines respectively of two successive couplets. For תרע read תרץ, and for תשלחם (the sense of which is not clear) read תחלצם. Some reference to the troublous side of Israel's early history is surely to be expected.

13 f. Read ואלהי (G, Bi.).—צוה. Read מַצִּיה (G, Kenn., Bi., We.). Cp. lxxiv. 12b.

21 f. M באלהים; read בְּלִהְיוֹם (dittographed). M וְשִׁמְךָ (with Pasek); read שִׁמְךָ. See on lvi. 11, and cp. lxxix. 31.—M נודה לעולם סלה. Read לעליון נִדְרֵינוּ נִשְׁלֵם. See on lxi. 10.—Supplement from lvi. 12.

## PSALM XLIV.—2.

**T**RIMETERS. A prayer of the innocent martyr-nation (vv. 18, 19, 21). The situation is briefly this. The Davidic king has been set aside, and further resistance has become hopeless. There is no security for life in the land of Israel; Israel is mocked by all, and captives or fugitives of its race are scattered everywhere. 'Where is thy God?' is the blasphemous cry of the Arabians and Jerahmeelites (cp. on xlii.—xliii., lv. and lxxix.). Israel has not deserved such a fate; it is true—sincerely true—to its legal obligations; indeed, it is its religious strictness which so exasperates its enemies. How can Yahwè be angry with his people? Israel is down-trodden—is even nigh to death. An appeal to the divine lovingkindness is its only hope. The (assumed) background, therefore, is, not the time of Hezekiah and Sennacherib (cp. Lag., *Mittheil.*, ii. 377), but that of the Exile.

The psalm is strikingly parallel to Pss. lx. and lxxix.<sup>(2)</sup>; indeed, it is as closely related to them as Ps. lxxiv. is to P's. lxxix. and the same circumstances are presupposed in it as in P's. xlii.—xliii. There is a strong imaginativeness in the assumed background, but the voice of conscious innocence, which demands a just retribution, is that of the *hasidim* throughout the period which opens with the establishment of the Law. In fact, the doctrine of retribution in this life lies at the root of the psalmist's complaints, and leads to the intemperate cry, 'Awake, O Yahwè,' which (see on l. 27) John Hyrcanus criticized.

Our view of the date and meaning of Ps. xlv.<sup>(2)</sup> is closely connected with text-critical considerations. If we venture on no important corrections of the text of M G, we shall probably incline to a Maccabæan date, for which the present writer has strongly argued in *OP*, 91-95. For this view there is both ancient and modern authority. Theodore of Mopsuestia,<sup>1</sup> Theodoret, Chrysostom conceived Ps. xlv. to be a prophecy of the Syrian persecution, and this view early became naturalized in England through the commentary on the Psalter (*In Ps. Librum Exegesis*) which was once assigned to Bede, and from which are derived the arguments prefixed to the psalms in the Anglo-Saxon version commonly known as the Paris Psalter.<sup>2</sup> Calvin and Bossuet inclined to it, and many moderns, including Hitzig, Bähgen, Buhl,<sup>3</sup> Wellhausen, Duhm, and Kautzsch, have

<sup>1</sup> See Bähgen, *ZATW*, vi. 273.

<sup>2</sup> See J. D. Bruce's able dissertation, Baltimore, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> *Zt. f. d. kirchl. Wiss.*, '83, p. 226, note (referring to 1 Macc. vi. 28-54). In *OP*, 93, I have referred to this passage and to 1 Macc. ix. 18 (death of Judas) as supplying fit occasions for the psalm (see also note *j*, p. 103).

accepted it in the more natural form that it is the expression of Jewish feeling under the Syrian persecution (see *OP*, 91-93). Those, however, who feel the difficulty of supposing a Maccabæan psalm were provided with a critical refuge by Ewald (*Dichter*, ii. 353 ff.; cp. *Hist.*, v. 120 note), and especially Robertson Smith (*OTJC*<sup>(2)</sup>, 438), whose view the present writer has repeatedly (e.g. *Kohut Memorial Volume*, '97, p. 115) endorsed, and in Germany Professor G. Beer (*Indiv. u. Gem. Ps.* p. lv.).

Certainly persecution of the Jews under Artaxerxes Ochus, such as Robertson Smith supposes, would plausibly explain a good number of psalms, and especially xliv., lxxiv., lxxix. Unfortunately, the evidence for it is but slight, and, according to Willrich (*Judaica*, 1900, pp. 35-39), there is no reason to suppose that the good relations between the Jews and the Persian kings were ever disturbed. It is true scholars like Nöldeke and Judeich have expressed an opposite view.<sup>1</sup>

A theory like that of Professor G. A. Barton (*Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, iii. [99], 744 ff.), who analyzes Ps. xlv. into three strophes, representing three different periods: (1) a song of triumph from the pre-exilic age, (2) a portion called forth by the defeat of the national armies in the time of Judas Maccabæus, and (3) a complaint occasioned by a religious persecution in the days of Bagoses, is liable to attack from several sides, and is really less plausible than any one of the chief competing hypotheses.

The most important of the new textual emendations relate to *ll.* 2, 16, 31. The first cuts away one of the chief grounds of the Maccabæan theory, viz. that the national armies had been recently defeated; the second points to the Arabians and Edomites as the chief enemies of the Jews; the third removes the reference to jackals, which Hitzig adduces as favourable to his theory that a defeat of the Jews near Jamnia (1 Macc. v. 56-62) was the occasion of the psalm (cp. 'Fox,' col. 1563, *Enc. Bib.*).

The objection to the new theory (apart from its textual basis) is that it implies a representation of the sufferings of the captivity, which is opposed to that of the late prophetic school of writers. Those sufferings were, from a theological point of view, occasioned by the sins of the former generations—their idolatry and their other illegalities. But Ps. xlv. and the related psalms expressly claim for the Jews the possession of legal righteousness. The psalmists, however, are neither prophets like Jeremiah nor church-historians like the Chronicler. Avoiding all distinct reference to contemporary history, they are obliged to adopt a more or less imaginary historical background, but the essential part of their poetical productions is not the assumed background, but the very real ideas and aspirations of the pious community which is the speaker. They could think themselves back into the external surroundings of an earlier age, but they could not, at the dictates of literary consistency, cease to be themselves. Bredenkamp's argument (*Gesetz u. Propheten*, 127, note) for an exilic date is therefore more ingenious than successful. The psalm must be post-exilic, and though a date in the late Persian period may (in spite of Willrich's criticism) not be impossible, it may appear safer to refer the psalm to the early Greek period, perhaps to the time when Palestine suffered so terribly from the first Ptolemy (cp. Willrich, *Juden. u. Griechen*, 24).

The points of contact with Pss. lx. and lxxxix. (see on *ll.* 1, 2, 5) are noteworthy. See also on Pss. lv., lxxiv.

### *Some stanzas lost.*

I	But now thou hast cast off our king,	10
	And succourest not in our distresses ;	
	Thou causest us to turn back from Missur,	11
	Those that hate us take spoil at their pleasure.	

<sup>1</sup> See Nöldeke, *Enc. Brit.*, xviii. 580; *Aufsätze zur pers. Gesch.*, 78; Judeich, *Studien*; Cheyne, *Intr. Is.*, 359.

- Thou givest us up to Cushan, to Jerahmeel, 12  
 And scatterest us among the nations ;  
 Thou sellest thy people cheaply, 13  
 And gainest nought by the purchase money.
- We are become a taunt to our neighbours, 14  
 10 A scoff and a jeer to those around us ;  
 Thou makest us a byword among the nations, 15  
 A thing for the peoples to shake the head at.
- My disgrace is before me continually, 16  
 The shame of my face covers me,  
 The mockery from Zarephath and Gebal, 17  
 From the sons of Arabia and of Amalek.
- All this has befallen us, but we have not forgotten thee, 18  
 We have not been false to thine ordinance ;  
 Our heart has not turned back, 19  
 20 Our steps have not swerved from thy way.
- If we had forgotten the name of our God, 21  
 Or stretched out our hands to an alien god,  
 Would not Yahwè search this out, 22  
 For he knows the secrets of the heart ?
- Nay, for thy sake Jerahmeel has killed us, 23  
 We are reckoned as sheep for slaughter.  
 Rouse thee, why art thou angry, O Lord ? 24  
 Awake, cast not off thy pious ones !
- Wherefore hidest thou thy face, 25  
 30 Forgetting our misery and oppression ?  
 For thou hast made us to dwell in dark places, 20  
 And enveloped us in gloom +of Deathland+.
- For our soul is bowed down to the dust, 26  
 Our body cleaves to the ground,  
 Arise to be our help, 27  
 Set us free for thy lovingkindness' sake.

1-4. Cp. lx. 12, lxxxix. 39, 43 f., lxxx. 13.—5-8. Cp. lx. 6, cvi. 27, Dt. xxxii. 30, Isa. lii. 3.—9. Cp. lxxix. 4, lxxx. 7.—קָלַס, a late word (Jer. xx. 8 only), cp. קָלַסָה (Ezek. xxii. 4), and the late verb קָלַס.

11 f. מִשֵּׁל, cp. Dt. xxviii. 37.—מָנוּחַ; cp. crit. n. on lxxx. 7.—17 f. Cp. xlii. 4, 7, lxxiv. 18, and see introd. The Arabians and Amalekites or Jerahmeelites, with Zarephath and Gebals represent those neighbouring people, which, even before the end, had (as

it seems) been encouraged by Nebuchadrezzar to invade Judah (2 K. xxiii. 2; see on Ps. lxxxiii.).—17–24. Cp. Job's protestations (Job xxxi.).—18. לָּ, as lxxxix. 34.—25. Cp. xlii.

8b (corr. text), lxix. 8, 10. This consciousness of legal righteousness is not confined to the psalms often regarded as Maccabæan (see e.g. Pss. iv., v., vii., xvi.—xviii., xxxv.).—26. כִּצְאוֹ טַבְחָה; cp. Jer. xi. 19, xii. 3, Isa. liii. 7.—27. Cp. vii. 7, lix. 6 (xlii. 10, xliii. 2). A vigorous criticism of the (traditional) reading, 'why sleepest thou'

(לִמָּה תִישָׁן), was made by 'the high-priest Johanan' (i.e. John Hyrcanus), who is said (*Sota*, 48a) to have abolished the daily liturgical use of v. 24 by Levites called מְעוֹרְרִים ('wakers'),

'Has God sleep? Does not the Scripture say, Behold the keeper of Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps?' Johanan added, however, that the words had a temporary justification with reference to the trouble of Israel as contrasted with the ease and prosperity of the nations of the world.—30. לַחֲיוֹ. So xlii. 10, xliii. 2.—33 f. Cp. cxix. 25.

*Critical Notes.* 1. M אָף G *vvù* δέ. Read וְעַתָּה.—M יו. The absolute use of זָנַח, though possible, is not probable. Read אֶת־מַלְכִּי. See on lxxxix. 39, lxxiv. 1.

2. M וְלֹא־תֵצֵא בְּצַבָּאוֹתֵינוּ. On this passage is based the theory that Ps. xlv. was written after a defeat of the Jews in the Maccabæan wars (see introd.). Comparing lx. 12 f., however, it becomes more than probable that we should read בְּצִרְוֹתֵינוּ.—3. Read (מ=ני).—5. 'Sheep of eating'? Read לִירְחֻמָּאֵל. Cp. lx. 6a (corr. text).

8. M רְבִית. Read הֶרְבִּית (Gr.). Cp. Prov. xxii. 16a.—9. For מְשִׁימוֹ (copied in error from *l.* 11) read הֵינִי with Duhm. See lxxxix. 4.

15. M מְקוֹל מְחָרָף וּמְגִדָּף. מְקוֹל is too weak, and we require ethnic names in this distich. Read

16. M מִפְּנֵי אוֹיֵב וּמִתְנַקֵּם. An earlier form of the text, however, gave וּמִתְקוֹמֵם; the line, thus read, would contain an allusion to viii. 3 (see note). But the original reading is probably very different, viz., לִקְרַח וְעַמְלֵק (cp. lix. 2).

25. M הוֹרֵנִי כְּלִהוּיִם, an odd expression. כְּלִהוּיִם is one of the disguises of יְרַחֲמֵאל (so e.g. lvi. 2). Read הֶרְנֵנִי יְרַח.—27 f. M לִמָּה תִנְאֹץ, preceded and followed by פִּסֵּק. Read לִמָּה תִישָׁן (similar case in lxxx. 5). תִישָׁן weakens the sense; we want a parallel to תִּזְנַח.—M אֶל־תִּזְנַח לִנְצַח. נִצַּח and חֶסֶד can be confounded (see on xiii. 2, xvi. 11, xvii. 15). Read אֶל־תִּסְדִּידָהּ.

31. M כִּי דִפְתָּנִי. Del., '(We have not become apostates from thee) so that thou shouldest therefore have brought upon us our present

misfortunes'; so Driver, *Tenses*, § 398, Obs. Kön. (*Synt.* § 394<sup>g</sup>) thinks that this is one of the cases in which a causal clause, through connection with a negative statement, has become concessive ("not . . . on the ground that" = "in spite of the fact that"). All very acute, but unconvincing. כִּי preceding a statement respecting God's severe treatment of his people cannot be so explained; see lxxviii. 4-10. Verse 23 was omitted in error, supplied in the margin, and at length inserted in the text at the wrong point. דָּכַ, however, cannot be the right word. Nothing else in the psalm indicates that Yahwè himself had taken an active part in breaking Israel to pieces. The complaint of the community is simply that Yahwè had permitted the enemies of Yahwè's religion to decimate the adherents of that religion, and so had enveloped Israel with a cloud of death-like gloom. The right verb can only be restored when we have corrected the startling phrase which follows.—*M* בְּמָקוֹם תַּנִּים, 'in a place of jackals,' Σ ἐν τόπῳ ἀοικήτῳ; cp. Jer. x. 22. But how can this be harmonized with דְּבִיתָנוּ? We should rather expect, 'Thou hast given us up as a portion for jackals' (lxiii. 11). Hitz., it is true, takes the phrase מָקוֹם תַּנִּים topographically, and thinks of the neighbourhood of Jamnia, where Joseph and Azarias were defeated (1 Macc. v. 56-62), and where jackals are said by travellers to abound. But the jackal is common (at the present day) throughout Palestine, and, the rest of the description being quite general, we are bound to ask whether Palestine, or the land of the Jews, may not be meant. The objection is that nothing has been said of the devastation of Palestine; the psalmist would surely not have passed this over. Thus none of these explanations is satisfactory; it remains to be considered whether the text is correct. One might first of all suspect תַּנִּים, which word, in Ezek. xxix. 3, xxxii. 2, is obviously miswritten for תַּנִּין, 'dragon.' With Ols. (1853) we might make the same correction here, and explain בְּמָקוֹם on the analogy of בְּמֵ אֲשֶׁר in Hos. ii. 1, where it is explained by Kimh̄i as = תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר (so recently Nowack, and Kön., § 393). The sense produced is, 'instead of (= as if we were) the dragon.' Israel's affliction will then be compared to the vengeance taken by the God of light on the dragon of chaos (cf. lxxiv. 13 f., lxxxix. 11, and see 'Dragon,' 'Rahab,' *Enc. Bib.*). It is Gunkel's merit (*Schöpfung*, 70 f.) to have stated this view forcibly; Olsh. had thought of the crocodile as the תַּנִּין. But in lxxiv. 13 f., lxxxix. 11, Rahab or Leviathan and the dragons symbolize the opponents of Yahwè, and Israel could not be classed among these. It is also extremely doubtful whether בְּמָקוֹם will bear to be rendered 'instead of.' We cannot (with Now. on Hos., *loc.*) defend this rendering by Isa. xxxiii. 21; the phrase in this passage is explained better by König (see Isaiah, Heb., *SBOT ad loc.*), and in Hos. ii. 1 בְּמָקוֹם = in the place of exile (cp. מְדִינָה אֲרָץ, Hos. ii. 2). Putting



aside theories about the chaos-dragon (however sound these may be<sup>1</sup>) let us seek some other way of correcting the text. What word will supply the most natural parallel to צלמות (l. 48)? Pss. lxxviii. 7 (corr. text). cvii. 10, 14, Job iii. 5, x. 21 give the answer; it is either חֶשֶׁךְ or כְּחֶשֶׁךְ. For 'במ' ת' read, beyond doubt, בְּמַחֲשָׁבִים (lxxxviii. 7). We can now perhaps solve the problem of דִּבִּית; should we read הוֹשַׁבְתָּנוּ (cxliii. 6, Lam. iii. 6)?

## PSALM XLV.

**T**ETRAMETERS. This is at once a coronation and a marriage song. It is the second Solomon whom the poet, conscious of a specially strong inspiration, sets himself to celebrate, drawing attention successively to the king's singular wisdom and eloquence (cp. 1 K. iv. 29-33, x. 6 f., 23 f.), to his success in warfare (2 Chr. viii. 3), and to the righteousness of his rule (1 K. iii. 16-28). All these endowments are the gifts of God; the chief of them, however, is the king's inflexible justice, which is the cause and origin of his political influence, of his extensive commerce and vast supply of gold (1 K. x.). It is the crown of his felicity that he has for his principal queen an Egyptian princess (cp. 1 K. iii. 1, xi. 1-3), whose beauty and rich apparel are admiringly described, and to whom a patriotic exhortation is addressed by the poet. Lastly, the king is encouraged by the prospect of a family of sons, whom (with an allusion to 1 K. iv.) he may place over the provinces of Palestine, which is in the narrower and stricter sense his kingdom. Each stanza contains six lines.

The psalm is parallel to Ps. lxxii. The peculiarity of it is that the king (the Messiah) is represented as *merely* an idealized Solomon, and the poet even follows his model by mentioning a royal harem. It is not altogether surprising that some have called the writer a court-poet, and compared him to Theocritus.

In spite of this it is no mere poetic illustration of a biography of Solomon that we have before us, but really a Messianic psalm; the king, as the Targum says, is 'king Messiah.' Just as the life of David contributes elements to the description of the idealized people of Israel, which is the speaker in Ps. xviii., so, but in much larger measure, the life of Solomon supplies a basis for the description of the ideal king in Ps. xlv.

Credit is due to Giesebrecht for his reassertion (*ZATW*, i. [181], 318) of the Solomonic reference of the psalm combined with that of its post-exilic date. He has also called attention to the parallelisms between Ps. xlv. and the Song of Songs, and if one of these (v. 9, מֶרַךְ וְאַהֲלֹת, cp. Cant. iv. 14) has now disappeared, the other (xlv. 10, 15, cp. Cant. vi. 8) acquires additional force through textual emendation. It now becomes superfluous to look for a contemporary king as the hero of the poem, whether one of the Ptolemies (e.g. Philadelphus, see *OP*, 166-174, but cp. *JRL*, 106 f.; *Christian Use of Psalms*, 154 f.), or one of the Asmonæan princes.

It is remarkable how little reality there is either in Ps. xlv. or in Ps. lxxii., except in the cry for justice which is audible in both. Did the Messianic hope burn more brightly in the hearts of the people than it seems to have done in those of the religious poets? We have to face the fact that the poet regards the conventional picture of Solomon as not unfit to be applied to the Messiah. It is true Solomon was not really a great conqueror, but the poet fancies that he was, and it is a painful reflection that the benefit of being subject to the Messianic king, typified (as was believed) by Solomon, has to be purchased by the 'nations' so dearly. 'How strongly this contrasts with the first of the great prophetic descriptions of the Servant of Yahwè (Isa. xlii. 1-4)!' See *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 145-158. Prof. W. S. Pratt, 'A Comparative Study of Ps. xlv.,' *JRL*, xix. [1900], 189-218, advocates a theory of composite structure, the nucleus

being vv. 9, 10, 13, and isolated words, &c., elsewhere. The textual basis, however, has not been made secure. Dr. Paul Reuben, who specially devotes himself to the textual basis, comes to very different results. 'Four stanzas, each of four stichi, written originally *βουστροφηδόν*. The main difficulty is a Pharisaic, anti-martial, addition in v. 5.' On the heading, see Introd.

*Deposited. For the Cushanites. Of the sons of Korah.*

*Deposited. Marked : of 'Arab-ethan.*

- |    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
|    |  | * 1 |
| 1  | My mind is devising goodly words ;                             | 2   |
|    | I bend mine ear +upwards+ to a new lay.                        |     |
|    | Thou art wise with more than human wisdom,                     | 3   |
|    | Poured upon thy lips is graciousness ;                         |     |
|    | Therefore Yahwè blesseth thee for ever,                        |     |
|    | <br>Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O thou hero!                | 4   |
|    | Draw forth the javelin, and grasp the buckler.                 |     |
|    | (?) Yahwè thy God will make thy course to prosper,(?)          | 5   |
| 10 | Because of his faithful and righteous covenant ;               |     |
|    | He will answer thee with the glorious deeds of his redressing  |     |
|    | right hand,  |     |
|    | Yahwè lifts thee up for ever and ever.                         | 7a  |
|    | <br>Upon those that hate thee, O thou hero ! thine arrows will |     |
|    | descend,   | 6   |
|    | They will fall upon the men of Arabia and Jerahmeel.           |     |
|    | A sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom,            | 7b  |
|    | Righteousness thou lovest, iniquity thou hatest ;              | 8   |
|    | Therefore peoples do homage unto thee,                         |     |
|    | [All] kindreds of the nations serve thee.                      |     |
|    | <br>Full of gold are all thy store-chambers,                   | 9   |
| 20 | Minas of Carchemish they bring unto thee ;                     |     |
|    | A daughter of kings stands +ready+ as thy consort,             | 10  |
|    | In the midst of court-women without number.                    |     |
|    | <br>Hearken, O Egyptian maiden ; lean thine ear ;              | 11  |
|    | Forget thine own people, and thine own father's house :        |     |
|    | For the king longs deeply for thy beauty ;                     | 12  |
|    | For he is thy lord, [and Yahwè's anointed] :                   |     |
|    | And unto thee will they bow down, O Egyptian maiden,           |     |
|    | with gifts,  | 13  |
| 30 | The richest of [all] people will sue for thy favour.           |     |

Upon her neck a wreath of coral ; 14  
 Brocade of gold is her raiment ;  
 To the king she is brought, her companions following her,<sup>1</sup> 15  
<sup>2</sup>With exultant joy they enter the palace.<sup>3</sup> 16  
 The crown of thine old age will be thy sons, 17  
 Whom thou wilt set as princes throughout the land.

### Appendix.

I will celebrate thy name from age to age, 18  
 So that peoples shall magnify thee for ever and ever.

1. See introd., and cp. lxxviii. 2. The close of *v.* 2 runs in M G, 'My tongue is the pen of a practised (or, swift, G *δὲ τυράφου*) scribe,' as if the psalm were an improvisation. This agrees with the common view of the meaning of *l.* 1, 'My mind bubbles up,' &c., but the poet is far from denying that his heavenly message has received a skilful setting from human art.

3 f. The wisdom of the king is necessarily prominent. The supposed parallel (Isa. xxxiii. 17) for the traditional reading, in which the king's beauty is extolled, is highly doubtful (see *SBOT, Isaiah*, Heb. text, p. 196). The eloquence of Solomon was also a part of the tradition. The Messianic king is to charm all who hear him as Solomon charmed the queen of Sheba. See introd. *Therefore*. Pleased with the worthiness of his chosen one, Yahwè solemnly grants him perpetuity of rule. Cp. on *l.* 17.

7-12. This address to the king, who is imagined as present, is in the strongest degree prophetic. Nominally it is the Messiah (cp. cx.) who takes judicial vengeance on Israel's enemies, but the all-subduing energy comes from Yahwè. The language in *ll.* 7 f. is partly modelled on that of xxxv. 3 (see crit. n.), which is an address to Yahwè.

(hero) too is applied elsewhere to Yahwè (cp. xxiv. 8, bis). *Covenant* reminds us of lxxxix. 29, 35, 40, and the whole line of Ps. cx., *l.* 8. *He will answer thee*, pointing to the constant prayers of the community for the day of Yahwè. *Glorious deeds*, *נִרְאָה* in its

derived sense, lxv. 6, cxxxix. 14, &c. *His redressing right hand*; cp. Isa. xli. 10. *Lifts thee up*; cp. iii. 4, xxviii. 9.—13 f. A special proof of the king's love of justice.

15. On the unexpected words, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,' see crit. note.—*A sceptre of justice*. It is equally justice which destroys the wicked with a 'sceptre of iron' (ii. 9), and which tends Israel with a pastoral staff (xxiii. 4). On *v.* 7a (in M) see crit. note.

17. **Therefore**, &c. Does this mean that the vassalage to which the other peoples of the earth are reduced is the divine reward of the king's justice, or that the peoples will hasten to proffer obedience to so righteous a ruler (cp. xcvi. 10-13)? Ps. lxxvii. 8-11 is parallel. Few will regret the mysterious passage about being anointed with the 'oil of joy,' a phrase which should be metaphorical (as Isa. lxi. 3), but which the context (*v.* 9 in M) would almost require us to take literally. And who are the 'associates' (*חֲבֵרִים*) to whom M makes the poet refer? Are they the other members of the royal caste? or are they the 'friends' of the bridegroom, usually called *מֵרְעִים*?

18 f. Again a great improvement in the text. M makes the poet abruptly turn aside to describe the bridegroom's perfumed dress. We then hear of 'ivory palaces' (why the plural?) and welcoming music, by which the law of parallelism is strangely violated, and at the same time pressure is put upon

Brought unto thee.

<sup>2</sup> They are brought.

<sup>3</sup> Of the king.

Hebrew usage. The revised text implies a reference to 1 K. x., and notice that in 1 K. x. 17 we hear of *manehs*, i.e. minæ, of gold. The mina of Carchemish was a standard weight.

21 f. **A daughter of kings.** If we kept the reading of M G ('daughters'), the phrase would be parallel to the 'queens' (מלכות) of Cant. vi. 8. But it is not likely that the inferior wives of the king should have this honorific title rather than the principal queen. Besides, the word in the next line, usually rendered 'the queen'

), is really a fragment of *piḡagšim*, 'concubines,' so that the queen must be referred to in *l.* 21. There is an allusion to 1 K. iii. 1, and, in *l.* 22, to 1 K. xi. 3 and Cant. vi. 8*b* and *c*. For *thy consort* cp. Mal. ii. 14. The last two lines of strophe 4, relating probably to the queen, are not extant.

25. **O Egyptian maiden.** The reading has less certainty here than in *l.* 29, but there is nothing better to offer. See introd.

27 ff. Two reasons why the foreign princess should identify herself with the land of Israel, 1. the king is in love with her, and 2. he is her lord and master (אֲרִינֶה; cp. Gen. xviii. 12).

We might have expected a further reason to be given, viz. that the gods of Egypt have been abased before Yahwè. But it is only added by way of encouragement that gifts will flow in from all parts to the consort of the king.

31 f. See 'Pearl,' 'Ouches,' *Enc. Bib.* 3—3. *Her companions*, i.e. the bride's attendants.

35 f. The king is addressed. Cp. Prov. xvii. 6, 'Children's children are the crown of old men.' See introd.

37 f. This couplet is outside the strophic division. As we see from this and from the use of הוֹכִיר (cp. lxxi. 16, lxxvii. 12 (Kt.), Isa. lxxiii. 7), it is the community which speaks, not the poet (as in *l.* 1, 2). Presumably, therefore, it is the name of Yahwè which is to be celebrated. Possibly two lines, in which Yahwè was mentioned, have fallen out; cp. cxxii. 18 f.

*Critical Notes.* 1. M רָחַשׁ. G ἔξηρεύξaro; W F, 'overflows (with).'

The sense 'to seethe' is supported by מרחשת, a cooking-vessel (? G, ἐσχάρα), Lev. ii. 7, vii. 9, but is unproven. Better, Driver, 'is astir (with)'; so Bā. But the true sense is 'swarms.' Now in no language could it be said, 'My mind swarms with goodly words.' If ר' were right, it would have to be followed by לשוני (Talmudic Hebrew would allow this). Herz, חרש; cf. Prov. xiv. 22, but חרש can only be used of evil devices. Read חשב, which corresponds to the artistic character of the poem.—M דבר טוב. W F, 'a theme that is good'; Driver, 'a goodly matter.' But *l.* 3 shows that words are meant. We might read, for clearness,

), a second Aramaism, followed by a word in an un-Hebraic sense (מעשי, Θ τὰ ποιήματά μου, as if 'my poems'), which also lays too much stress on the personal feelings of the writer. Comparing xlix. 5 we should read אֶפְהָ אֲזֵנִי לְמִשַּׁל חָדָשׁ. in מעשי is a corruption of or substitute for ל; י is a fragment of the closing ל. למל in למלך comes from למשל. The final כ with the following לש represents חדש; שוני עש comes from אֶפְהָ אֲזֵנִי, which phrase was written twice over. סופר מהיר represents הוֹסֵפֶת חֲכָמָה (see on *l.* 3). Thus we are free from the singular comparison of the tongue to a pen.

3. M's **יִפִּית** has arisen out of a dittographed **הוֹסֶפֶת** (see on *l.* 2). For the phrase **הוֹסֶת חִכְמָה**, cp. *1 K. x. 11* (Solomon). Wisdom and eloquence are rightly combined; against the ordinary view, see *exeg. note*. On **יִפִּית** see *Kön. i. 584*. *G S 'A 2 E'*, however, presuppose **יִפִּי יִפִּית** (so too *Bä.*; *Du.*, **יִפּוֹ**). *Ges.*, *Ol.*, *Hu.*, *Kau.*, *We.*, **יִפִּית**; *Now.*, *Haupt* (see *SBOT*), **יִפִּית**.

7—9. Read **יִרְכֶּךָ** (*G 2, Gr.*), and, in *l.* 8, **יְהִיֶּךָ וְיִחַיֶּךָ צֶנְהָ**, comparing *xxxv. 2 f.*, where we read **שָׁכֵר**, probably a synonym of **תִּרְתָּח**, 'javelin' (see on *xxxv. 2, lv. 22*). The corruptions are very obvious; note that **צֶלַח** does double duty—for **צֶנְהָ** and for **יִצְלִיחַ**. (Observe the *Paseḵ* before **צֶלַח**.) M's text suggests that **הוֹד וְהוֹדֵר** was the name of the king's Excalibur, which is, of course, absurd. What follows is uncertain. **רַכֵּב** may have various origins. Coming after **צֶלַח** one may think first of **דִּרְכֶּךָ**. To **יְהוֹה אֱלֹהֶיךָ יֵצ' דר'** prefix **יְהוֹה אֱלֹהֶיךָ**, which fell out owing to its resemblance to **הוֹדֵר וְהוֹדֵר**. For **רַכֵּב**, however, *G* apparently reads **מֶלֶךְ** (*βασιλευς*), unless indeed *βαρ.* represents a variant which fixed itself in the text beside **צֶלַח**. At any rate, some statement bringing *Yahwè* into relation to the king's conquests seems to be required (*cp. cx. 5*). **רַכֵּב** cannot be right; there is no parallel for the pregnant sense 'ride into battle' (*Siegfr.-Sta.*), and horses and chariots were opposed to the theocratic ideal (see on *xx. 7*, and *cp. Zech. ix. 9*). *G's* *ἐντεινον* implies **וְהִדְרֶךָ** (*Jer. ix. 2*), which *Horsley* and *Hitzig* adopt; but would not such an exhortation be premature (see *l. 13*)? It is, however, at any rate, an error to regard the second **וְהוֹדֵר** as a mere dittographic echo (*Ol.*, *Del.*, *Hu.*?; *Kön.*, *Styl.*, 302).

10. M **עַל־יְדֵבֶר אֱמֶת וְעִנּוּה־צֶדֶק**, i.e. 'for the cause of faithfulness and humility, (and) righteousness' (*Bä.*), 'for the protection of faithfulness, and for answering righteousness' (*Du.*), 'for truth and meekly-gotten victory' (*King, Asaph-psalms, 25*). First, as to **עִנּוּה־צֶדֶק**. Observe the similar *asyndeton* in *v. 9*, where (as also here) it is not recognized by *G*. The pointing, however, implies **עִנּוּת צֶדֶק** (*'A, καὶ*

*δικαίας*)—an impossible phrase. T **וְעִנּוּה וצֶדֶק**; *G* **וצֶדֶק**

*πραύτητος κ. δικαιοσύνης*). *Stade* and *Kau.* omit **צֶדֶק**; but this

makes the line too short. *Ol.*, *Bi.* follow *G*, but omit the first **ו**. But can **עִנּוּה** and **צֶדֶק** be combined thus? Is there not a redundancy? So at least thinks *Wellh.*, who further remarks that **עִנּוּה** seems to conceal some term analogous to the preceding **דִּבֶּר**. But the only such term is **עִנּוּ** 'business,' 'matter,' an *Aram.* word in *Koheleth*. *Duhm* takes **עִנּוּה** to be *Infin. Kal.* with fem. ending. But the word is surely corrupt; the word which it represents belongs to the next line (see next note). And what of **עַל־יְדֵבֶר**? Clearly it is too prosaic a phrase (*cp. on cx. 4*).

The requisite word is **ברית** (cp. lxxxix. 4, 35, 40). For metre's sake, read **עָלֵי בְרִית**.—Next as to **אֶמֶת** and **צֶדֶק**. The object of the king's expedition is supposed to be the maintenance of the *cause* of fidelity and righteousness (perhaps also of humility), i.e. of the cause of the king's faithful and righteous subjects (the **עֲנוּיִם** or **צְדִיקִים**). Ges., however (*Thes.* s.v.), takes **אֶמֶת** to mean the king's fidelity to his promise. But however we explain the phrase, it is an unnatural one. We require in this context a reference to God's 'fidelity' and 'righteousness,' and such a reference exists if we read **עָלֵי בְרִית אֶמֶתוֹ וְצֶדֶקוֹ**, or, as lxxxix. 34 suggests, **וְחֶסֶדוֹ וְצֶדֶקוֹ** (**צֶדֶק** and **חֶסֶד** are liable to confusion; cp. *ασσεδ* and *ασσεδεκ*, rival readings of G in Isa. xix. 18. and a note on cxliv. 2). Cp. Ps. cx., l. 8.

in **וְעִנְהֻצ'** (see above) is a corruption of  
(like **וְתוֹרֶתְךָ** in xl. 9b) is a corruption of **נֹרְאוֹת** (dittographed), unless indeed both **וְתוֹר'** and **נֹר'** are corruptions of **גְּבוּרוֹת**.—For **יְמִינֶךָ** read **יְמִין צֶדֶקוֹ** (cp. xlvi. 11, Isa. xli. 10). **יְמִין צֶדֶקוֹ** fell out through its resemblance to **חֲצִיד** which follows, **ך** arose from assimilation of **יְמִין** to **חֲצִיד**. Clearly Yahwè's right hand, not the king's, must be referred to (cp. xviii. 36, xx. 7, xlvi. 11, liv. 7, lx. 7, &c.).

12. The sixth line of str. 2 is produced by the transference of the first half of *v.* 7, which in M is **בְּסִטְאֶךָ אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וָעֶד**, a corrupt passage which is most easily corrected into **נִשְׁאָה וְגו'** (see on l. 15).

13 f. **שְׁוֹנָיִךְ** and **עֲמִים שְׁנוּנִים** may both represent

possibly comes from **יְנַחֲתִי** (xxxviii. 3). Add **גְּבוּר** [ה]; G

ε.—In l. 14 we must surely restore **עֲרִבִים וִירַחֲמָאִלִּים**.

probably = **ב[ע]רֵב אֵיב**. **אֵיב** constantly represents **עֲרִבִי** or **מֶלֶךְ** as commonly is a distortion of **וְלֵ**

*V.* 7a seems at first like an insertion; it makes strophe 3 too long by one line. Those who either disregard structural considerations altogether, or (like Duhm) make the strophes virtually tristichs, will disallow this objection. The fact, however, remains that *v.* 7a is inconsistent with the context, which is an address to the king. Hence Saad., quoted by Ibn Ezra, paraphrases, 'God shall establish thy throne for ever and ever,' and Street (1790) and Ol. (1853) would prefix **הַכִּין** or the like. Lag. and Driver (*Tenses*, § 194), however, prefer to change **וְעֵד** into **סֵעֵד**, while Bi. and Che.<sup>(1)</sup> suppose *v.* 7a to contain parts of two lines, which in the usual parallelistic form express the eternal duration of the king's dynasty. Any one of these views seems to me more plausible than the very simple expedient suggested by Bruston (so too Matthes, Giesebrecht, Wellh., Eerdmans (*Th. Tijdschr.* '94, p. 277), Duhm) of putting

the very weak word יהיה for the divine name, יהוה (substituted correctly, for the editorial reading אלהים), or of omitting אלהים, as suggested by Nöldeke (*ZATW*, '88, p. 156 f.). Still, we do not expect the eternal duration of the dynasty to be referred to; the poet is absorbed just now in the thought of the king's perfect righteousness. The line might be the pious ejaculation of an early reader (cp. Lam. v. 19) who considered Yahwè to be the all-sufficient king of Israel (cp. xliv. 5). Hort's explanation (note on Heb. i. 8), 'God is thy throne,' and Hupfeld's, 'Thy throne is [a throne of] God' (defended by König, § 277 f.) are at any rate too difficult. All this speculating, however, is rendered unnecessary by the correction proposed above (on l. 12).

17 f. We have seen (see exeg. note) how improbable M's reading is; note also the Paseḳ after על־כן. Read probably על־כֵּן יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְךָ, and continue [כָּל־] מִשְׁפַּחַת עַמִּים יַעֲבֹדוּךָ, and continue [כָּל־] מִשְׁפַּחַת עַמִּים יַעֲבֹדוּךָ, and continue [כָּל־] מִשְׁפַּחַת עַמִּים יַעֲבֹדוּךָ. For the confusion between מִשְׁחָךְ and יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה cp. a parallel in ll. 28 f.

18. In M, the plur. form בְּגִדֹת, and the asyndeton (קְצִיעוֹת without ו, but G inserts καί; cp. on l. 10) are suspicious. Note too that קְצִיעָה (sing.) only occurs once elsewhere—as the name of one of Job's daughters (Job xlii. 14), and that there it must be corrupt (see 'Kezia,' *Enc. Bib.*). Bi. and Du. omit; Herz, most ingeniously, reads הוֹצֵק (עַל); cp. l. 4. But there is deep-seated error. Read מִלֵּאוֹת דָּרוֹץ בְּלִמְגֹרֶתֶיךָ.

19. מְנִי cannot mean 'harp-strings.' It is true Driver and Cowley refer to our passage in their note on Sirach xxxix. 15 (Heb.), but G there must be right against the Heb. text. The versions found no reference to music. מְנִי הַיִּבְלִי שֵׁן too is peculiar (see exeg. note). Bp. Horsley, 'from cabinets of ivory of Armenia'; similarly Kay, except as regards 'Armenia' (cp. T). Read probably מְנִי בְּרַכְמִישׁ יוֹבְלוֹ לְךָ; cp. on lxviii. 31 f.

21. M בְּנוֹת מַלְכִים. Against this, see exeg. note. Read לְ בְּנוֹת מַלְכִים, Baer and Ginsb. (Ben Asher), or (cp. Kön. ii. a, 275, 489) בְּבִיקְרוֹתֶיךָ, as if 'among thy beloved ones' (i.e. the women of the harem?) but none of the versions sanction this. See Bā., who proposes בְּבִיקְרוֹתֶיךָ 'within thy walls.' Duhm, בְּבִיקְרוֹת נֶצְבִי, 'come forward in jewels.' Much better Grätz, לְקִרְאָתְךָ (cp. Ex. v. 20, vii. 15, Num. xxii. 34). Best of all (with בַּת מֶ) is probably חֲבֵרֶתְךָ (cp. Mal. ii. 14).

22. M שֶׁנֶּל לִמְיֹנֶה בְּכַתֶּם אוֹפִיר. שֶׁנֶּל of the Persian queen, Neh. ii. 6; cp. Dan. v. 2 f., 23 (Aram.). But we expect an allusion to the story of Solomon, whose principal wife is nowhere called שֶׁנֶּל, and we do not just yet expect a reference (unsupported by parallelism) to the splendid dress of the queen. The expression בְּכַתֶּם אוֹפִיר is also too vague.

G apparently read **כָּסֶת** (*κατισμῶ*); Grätz, **בְּכֶתֶר** (so Che., *Enc. Bib.* i. 962; Herz). But we should certainly read (remedying the disarrangement of the letters), **בְּתוֹךְ פִּילִגְשִׁים אֵין מְסַפֵּר**; cp. 1 K. xi. 3, and especially Cant. vi. 8*b* and *c*.

25. M **בֵּית וִרְאִי**. Read **בֵּית מְצָרִים** (see on *l.* 29).—27 f. Prefix **כִּי** with G<sup>B</sup> (*ὅτι*); the *kai* of G<sup>Ne.a</sup> AT seems a wrong correction; note that **כ** precedes. For **יִתְאַוּה** read **יִתְאַוֶּה**. For **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִי לוֹ** read **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִי לָךְ**. **לָךְ** became **לוֹ** when the words were wrongly attached to *v.* 12. Really it is the obsequiousness of foreigners to the great king's spouse that is referred to; the words should introduce *l.* 29. In their place, as the close of *l.* 28, read probably **וּמִשִּׁיחַ יְהוָה** (cp. 1 S. xxvi. 16*a*), which fell out owing to its resemblance to **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִי** (for a parallel see on *l.* 17).

29. Read certainly **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִי לָךְ בְּתִמְצָרִים**. G *καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτῇ θυγατέρες Τύρου* (so G, but closing *l.* 28 as in M). Gr. follows S; Herz prefers to read (*l.* 28 f.) **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִי לוֹ בְּתִמְצָר**. But a satisfactory view of the whole stanza has to be obtained. **צָר** from **מִצָּר**, as in lxxxiii. 8, lxxxvii. 4 (see notes).

30. M **עָם**. Read **עַמִּים**, or (Herz) **כָּל-עָם**. **כָּל** perhaps fell out through the proximity (in M) of **כָּל-כְּבוֹדָה**.

31. M **כָּל-כְּבוֹדָה בְּתִמְצָלָךְ פְּנִימָה**. Bā., Kau., &c., 'All splendour is the king's daughter within (the palace).' But the vague **בְּ**, the form **כ'**, and **פְּנִימָה**, unsupported by a verb, are all equally improbable. The latter word Krochmal, Grätz, Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We. correct into **פְּנִינִים**—an improvement (wrongly questioned by Pratt), but insufficient. Read probably **עַל-נִרְנָרְתֶּיהָ עֲנֵק פְּנִינִים**; cp. Prov. i. 9, Ex. xxviii. 22, 24, Prov. iii. 15 (Kt. **פְּנִינִים**). Note the corruption of *ἔσθωθεν* in G (B **א**) into *εσθωεν*, which Duhm strangely traces to **חֲשָׁמֶל**.

32. Read **מִשְׁבָּצוֹת**; initial **מ** in M is a dittogram. With Herz, read **לְלִבּוֹשָׁה**.

33 f. Read **לְמַלְכָּךְ תּוֹבֵל אַחֲרֶיהָ רֵעוּתֶיהָ** (W F, 'on parti-coloured+cushions+') has arisen out of **לְמַלְכָּךְ תּוֹבֵל** out of **תּוֹבֵל**; rampant dittography. **לְךָ מוֹבָאוֹת** an editorial supplement.—M inserts **תּוֹבֵלָה** and **מֶלֶךְ**.

35. M **תַּחַת אֲבֹתֶיךָ**. This does not make sense. In *l.* 36 it is said that the sons shall be made princes or governors by their father; we should therefore have expected **אֲבוֹהֶם**. Herz corrects **בֵּיתֶךָ** or **תַּחַת שִׁיבֹתֶךָ**. No doubt **ש** is right; the sibilant **ש** easily fell out after **ת**. But **תַּחַת** is hardly correct; read **עֲמֻרַת** (Prov. xvii. 6).

38. For **יְהוּדֶיךָ** read **יְגִדְלוֹךְ** (cp. on xxviii. 7).



## PSALM XLVI.

**TETRAMETERS.** The companion-psalms are xlvi. and lxxvi. The psalmist imagines himself in the midst of the events preceding the great judgment. He writes in the spirit of Isa. viii. 8b-10, which is the insertion of a later editor in a prophecy of Isaiah. It may even be from this passage that he derives the עֲמֹנִי of the refrain; certainly another prophecy (Isa. xvii. 14) has influenced l. 12. The picture in the first stanza is that of a great upheaval of the powers hostile to Yahwè, symbolized by the ocean, and especially of the Jerahmeelites or Arabians (l. 20). Pious Israel remains unshaken and dauntless; it rejoices in the sense of its security, even when the tide of invasion (cp. Isa. viii. 8) comes close up to the walls of Jerusalem. It knows that Zion is in no real danger. The darkest night has its appointed limit; with the dawn Yahwè (invisibly present throughout) will appear (cp. xxx. 6, xc. 14). Then, with a mighty peal of thunder, the divine judgment will take place (lxxvi. 9 f.). This occupies the first two stanzas. In the third the feelings of the rescued people of Yahwè are described (cp. Isa. xxxiii. 18-21). They go out (cp. Isa. lxvi. 24) and watch the destruction of the implements of war—a scene suggested no doubt by Isa. ix. 5 [4]. Universal peace is now the prospect for the future—a leading feature in a Messianic description (see lxxvi. 4, Isa. ii. 2-4, Mic. iv. 1-4). Should the survivors of the hostile nations cherish the idea of rebellion against Yahwè (cp. ii. 1), they are warned by a divine oracle to desist.

The psalm is strongly Messianic (Stade, *Akad. Reden*, 67 f.), cp. Ps. lxx. Neither the deliverance from Sennacherib, nor any other event in Israel's history, could suggest the idea of an endless and universal reign of peace (vv. 9 f). To assign Pss. xlv. and xlvi. to the time of Isaiah (Ew.) is, therefore, impossible (cp. on xlvii.). It is possible, however, that some temporary deliverance of the Jews in post-exilic times may have added fuel to the flame of the Messianic hope; the successes of Alexander may have seemed to some a foretaste of the fulfilment of the promises (cp. Isa. xxv. 1-5?). Cp. Beer, *Indiv. Ps.*, p. xlv.

The titles of God in this psalm deserve attention—Yahwè Sebaoth (xxiv. 10), Jacob's God (xx. 2), Elyon (xxi. 8), all favourites of later writers.

*Deposited. Of the sons of Korah. Of Salmah. Marked.* 1

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| I  | Yahwè is unto us a refuge and a rock,                | 2 |
|    | He is found continually a help in troubles.          |   |
|    | Therefore have we no fear, though the earth rock,    | 3 |
|    | Though the mountains tumble into the ocean's midst : |   |
|    | The billows of the sea may roar,                     | 4 |
|    | The mountains may quake at the insolence thereof,    |   |
|    | [Yahwè Sēbāōth is] on our side,                      | 5 |
|    | Our sure retreat is Jacob's God.                     |   |
|    | Let the city of our God [Yahwè] rejoice—             |   |
| 10 | The holy dwelling-place of the most High.            |   |
|    | God is in the midst of her ; she cannot totter ;     | 6 |
|    | God will help her at the turn of the morn.           |   |
|    | Nations roar, kingdoms show enmity ;                 | 7 |
|    | He utters his voice ; +then+ the earth rocks.        |   |
|    | Yahwè Sēbāōth is on our side,                        | 8 |
|    | Our sure retreat is Jacob's God.                     |   |

- Go, look at the wonderful works of Yahwè, 9  
 Who has extinguished Jerahmeelites to the end of the land ! 10  
 He breaks the bow and snaps the spear,  
 20 [The shield of] Jerahmeel he burns with fire.  
 'Desist ; assure yourselves that I am God, 11  
 +That+ I am sovereign among the nations, sovereign over  
 the earth.'  
 Yahwè Sēbāōth is on our side, 12  
 Our sure retreat is Jacob's God.

2. נִמְצָא strictly, 'he lets himself be found', i.e. by those that seek him (2 Chr. xv. 2).—5. There may be here a distant echo of the myth of the dragon (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Dragon'). So Gunkel. —9. One regrets to resign the supposed parallel to Isa. xxxiii. 21 which M's text apparently provides (see Del.); but textual criticism compels us. Nor is it possible to arrive at any agreement as to the right translation of M ; critics

will differ everlastingly, because the text is corrupt. See crit. note.

12. לִפְנוֹת בְּקֶר. Duhm rightly compares Isa. xvii. 14, and sees an allusion to the story of the destruction of Sennacherib's army. See on Ps. xlviii.

17. The same exhortation in lxvi. 5. See introd.—19 f. See lxxvi., ll. 5, 6.

22. רִים, 'to show oneself supreme or victorious'; cp. xxi. 14, lvii. 6, 12.

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. M עָן. Read either מַעַן or (better) צַר. See on xxviii. 8.—M מֵאֵד. Read תַּמִּיד (S, Gr.); cp. on ix. 10, cxii. 1, cxix. 4.

3. M בִּהְמִיר. The intrans. use of הִמִּיר is far from probable. Ol., 'when he (God) changes the earth'; but we should then expect בִּהְחִלִּי (cii. 27). The final ר seems influenced by ר in אֶרֶץ. Read probably בִּהְמוֹג (Kr., Gr.); cp. *L.* 14. *G* ἐν τῷ παράσσεισθαι. The verb παρ. occurs four times in this psalm in *G*. Here, however, we should do best to correct ἀλλάσσεισθαι. The τ is influenced by τω; ρ and λ confounded phonetically.

5. M מִימִי. Read גִּלִּי יָם (cf. lxv. 8). Herz, מִי יָם.—Omit יַחְמֹר, a faulty variant to יַהֲמוּ; cf. lxxv. 19, where חֲמָה is mis-written חֲמָר.

7-9. M נָהָר פְּלִנְיוּ יִשְׁמַחוּ עִיר־אֱלֹהִים. What can this mean? Hitz. renders ll. 9, 10, "The Holy One of the dwelling-place of the Most High is a river," &c. But what circuitous phraseology! and what a strange comparison! xlviii. 2 will not justify the one, nor Isa. xxxiii. 21 the other, for both these passages are in disorder. Shall we, then, prefix חֲסִדִּי (Bi.<sup>(1)</sup>, Che.<sup>(1)</sup>), or the like? But that would be violent, and the result not adequate. Very possibly the above words represent the greater part of the refrain of the psalm. It is true, many since Ew. have

restored this refrain at the end of the first stanza. But they have not noticed that a part of it may exist in a distorted form in the text. The first elements that strike us are **שם** and **ני**, which clearly make up **משנב**. We can then perhaps recognize **נהר** in **ע[מנ]**, and **לנו** in **פל** (**נו** more obviously = **מ**, but **מ** and **פ** are frequently confounded). **אלהי עיר** is a similarly distorted form of **יעקב**. Transpositions both of words and of parts of words are by no means uncommon in the traditional text. Hence **יעקב** (the less common form of **יעקב**) became **קועב**, and **אלהים** (written 'אלהי') was placed after the miswritten **קועב** (which by corruption became **עיר**). But **ישמחו** (**חו עיר**) has to do double duty. It stands in the second place for **ל**. 1 of stanza 2. Correct the first word into **תשמח** (cf. xlvi. 12), and read **יהוה אלהינו**. **סלה** (v. 4, end) is probably a corruption of **אלהים**; the **סלה** in vv. 8, 12 is an unintelligent assimilation to v. 4. G, however, has none in v. 12.

10. M **קדש משכן עליון**. Σ τὸ ἅγιον τῆς κατασκευῆς τοῦ ὑψίστου; *J sanctum tabernaculum altissimi*. But this rendering would require **קדש משכנו** or **משכן**, because 1. **קדש** is an adjective; and 2. **משכנים** (masc. pl.) only occurs once again—in Ezek. xxv. 4, and there means the tents of nomads). Bā., therefore (so too Now., Bertholet, and Herz), adopts G's text, ἡγίασε τὸ σκῆμα αὐτοῦ ὁ ὑψιστος = **קדש משכן עליון**. But this does not give the most appropriate sense. The declaration of Zion's inviolableness naturally begins with the statement, 'God is in the midst of her'; indeed, **בקרבה** suggests, if it does not necessarily imply, that **עיר** (fem.) immediately precedes. Read, therefore (transposing; see last note), **משכן קדש עליון**.

13. M **מטין**. If this is right, the 'tottering' of the kingdoms is the result of the 'roaring,' i.e. the hostile demonstrations, of the nations. But the psalm suggests (cp. lxxvi.) that Judah is the object of attack. Read perhaps **שטמו** (cp. on lv. 9). If so, **ל**. 14 gains in force.

17. M **מפעלות**. Read **נפלאות** (lxvi. 5). See on xlvi. 2.—M inserts **אשרשם שמות בארץ**; so too G, except that *τέρατα* implies **מופת**, which Lagarde adopts, instead of the unique plural **שמות**. The clause, however, is suspicious, on account 1. of the prosaic **אשרשם**, and 2. of its metrical superfluity. It seems to have grown out of **מופת**, which is properly a variant to **נפלאות**. The expander may have modelled the clause on lxxviii. 43. Probably he read **שנו**; **מופת** is dittographed. Herz, less suitably, **משמות**.

18. M **מלחמות**. But it is not the thought of the tranquillity of distant lands which lifts up the speaker's consciousness. Read

יִרְחֶמָאֵל, and see on the || passage, lxxvi. 4.—20. Read probably [מִנֵּן] יִרְחֶמָאֵל; cp. lxxvi. 1. 6. מ עֲנָלוֹת ‘waggons.’ G *θυρεούς*; T עֲנִילוֹן ‘shields.’ Hence Bā., Kirkpatr. עֲנָלוֹת. But in Num. xxxi. 50, Ezek. xvi. 12, עֲנִיל=‘ring.’ Most probably, however, עֲנִי comes from יִרְחֶמָאֵל.

## PSALM XLVII.

**T**RIMETERS. A summons to all peoples to pay homage to Yahwè, whose capital is Jerusalem, but whose realm is the world. It has a real though secondary connection with Pss. xlv. and xlviii. (cp. ‘Jacob,’ v. 5, xlv. 8, 12; ‘a great king,’ v. 3, xlviii. 3; ‘the Jerahmeelites,’ v. 4, xlviii. 5; ‘greatly to be revered is our God,’ v. 10, xlviii. 2; cp. also v. 2 with xlviii. 3). But it is more closely related to the other coronation or accession psalms (xcv.—c.; see *OP*, 163; Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, 456). It has also points of contact with P. xviii.; cp. especially v. 4 with xviii. 48, and note that v. 2 and 10 imply the same idea as xviii. 45<sup>b</sup> (‘aliens sought me eagerly’). Duhm speaks satirically of the ‘astounding naïveté’ imputed to the Jews by the received text of v. 4, 5, and accordingly emends the text. But the naïveté is found elsewhere (e.g. in Isa. lx. 14), and was a necessary consequence of the combination of particularistic and universalistic elements in early Judaism. The psalm is as strongly Messianic as Pss. xlv. and xlviii. The poet projects himself into the Messianic future, when Israel’s foes, represented by Edom, will have been crushed (cp. ii. 10, xviii. 39, 48<sup>b</sup>, lxxv. 6 ff., Mic. iv. 13). It is true we might, with Ol., regard the subjugation and forcible conversion of the Idumæans by John Hyrcanus (cp. Bertholet, *Stellung*, 239) as the occasion of the psalm. Simon’s league with the Romans (1 Macc. xiv. 24, 26, 40), if historical, might also be thought of. But these are makeshift theories. The Messianic key fits the lock better than any historical one. There are some bad corruptions in the text, which, of course, have led to faulty exegesis. The supposed parallel in v. 6 to lxxviii. 19 disappears, but in compensation we get two fresh parallels in v. 10 (*ll.* 19 f.) to lxxxix. 8, 19. On the period and ideas of the psalm, cp. Diehl’s dissertation.

*Deposited. Of the sons of Korah. Marked.*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    |  | 1 |
| 1  | O all ye peoples, clap your hands,     | 2 |
|    | Shout ye unto God with ringing cries ; |   |
|    | For Yahwè is most high and terrible,   | 3 |
|    | A great king over all the earth.       |   |
|    | The Edomites he crushed under us,      | 4 |
|    | The Jerahmeelites under our feet ;     |   |
|    | He liberated for us his inheritance,   | 5 |
|    | The ornament of Jacob whom he loved.   |   |
|    | Praise ye God with shouting,           | 6 |
| 10 | Yahwè with the sound of the horn.      |   |
|    | Make melody to our God, make melody,   | 7 |
|    | Make melody to our King, make melody.  |   |

- For Yahwè is the King of all the earth, 8  
 Make melody to our King, [make melody ;]  
 Yahwè reigns over the nations, 9  
 Yahwè is seated on his holy throne.  
 Bless our King, O ye peoples, 10  
 Praise our God, O ye peoples ;  
 For Yahwè is unto us a shield,  
 20 Greatly to be revered is our God.

4, 13. **All the land.** Or, possibly, 'all the land (of Canaan).' Cp. xcv. 3 (coir. text).

God of Abraham' (cp. Gen. xvii. 4), must reluctantly be given up. See crit. n.

7. **The ornament** (נֶאֱמָר); cp. Isa. xiii. 19, and, for the idea, Jer. iii. 19.

19 f. **Unto us a shield.** So lxxxix. 19.—*Greatly to be revered.* See lxxxix. 8, and cp. the similar form of xlvi. 2 (l. 1).

17 f. The suggestive phrase, 'the

*Critical Notes.* 5. M יִדְבַּר. G *iméraξe*, rightly as regards the tense (Kön. § 194 f.). Read, however, יִדְבָּא, as in xviii. 48 (see note). This fits the reference to the Edomites.—For עַמִּים read אֲדָמִים (as xlix. 2), and for לְאֻמִּים read יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים. There is now no inconsistency with v. 2.—M closes v. 5 with סֵלָה; so G (B, but not A T). סֵלָה, however, is either a corruption of לֹלֵה *i.e.* הִלְלֵי (see next note), or transferred from v. 4 (end), in which case it would come from מֵאֵל (see last note).

7. M G יִבְחַר; 'chose anew' ?? Read probably יִפְרֹק; cp. cxxxvi. 24.—Read נִחַלְתּוּ (G; Du.).

9. M עֲלָה. Why the completion of the work for Israel described in ll. 5-8 should be marked by Yahwè's ascent (whither?) amidst shouting, is not plain. Duhm is obliged to suppose that עֲלָה was a technical term of the sacrificial cultus. But עֲלָה is simply a corruption of a dittographed סֵלָה (see last note).

11 f. Read אֶלְהֵינוּ with Diehl, after G.—M מִשְׁכִּיל. 'The superscription of many psalms; according to 2 Chr. xxx. 22 a term for a particular kind of musical performance' (Duhm)? Read לְמִלְכֵּנוּ (ש) became נו). Cp. 'Maschil,' *Enc. Bib.*—Insert זִמְרוֹ (metre).

17 f. The narrative statement in M is very strange, nor is the sense plain. R.V. renders, '... (to be) the people of the God of Abraham.' The phrase would imply that distinctions of peoples were henceforth abolished. But this would go beyond Ps. lxxxvii. (cp. Isa. xix. 24 f.), and is in itself doubtful. The grammatical basis of the rendering

hardly admits an accus.) is also insecure. G S read עַם (so Cappellus, Ew., Dy., &c.) ; Hi., Ol. (formerly), Lag., Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, and Du. suppose that עַם dropped out before עַם ; but what does עַם mean—'with' or 'equally with' ? Gr. reads אֱלֹהִים. The phrase 'Abraham's God' is also unexpected here ; we expect 'Jacob's God.' Lastly, the psalm should close, as it began, with a summons to praise Yahwè. There must be deep corruption. Read אֲבִרְחָם בִּרְכּוֹ עַמִּים מְלִפְנֵי שְׁבָחוֹ עַמִּים אֱלֹהֵינוּ has sprung out of a dittographed אֱלֹהֵינוּ. נֶאֱסַפּוֹ is made up out of נוּ, the last syllable of מַלְכֵנוּ, and a corruption of שְׁבָחוֹ. For מַלְכֵנוּ we might read נֶאֱלָנוּ, but ll. 12, 14, 17 dissuade from this.

19. M כִּי לְאַלְלוֹתִים מְגִי־אֶרֶץ. What can the 'shields of the earth' mean ? Stade's proposal (*ZATW*, '94, pp. 322 ff.) to read שְׁלִיטֵי is ingenious but very far-fetched. The right solution follows from our correction of M of lxxxix. 19. Read כִּי־יִהְיֶה כֶּגֶן לָנוּ ; פִּירְיָהוּ אֶרֶץ belongs to the next line.

20. M מֵאֵד נֶעְלָה. Gr., Bi., Du. insert עַל־כָּל־אֱלֹהִים (xcvii. 9). Read rather (taking over M's אֶרֶץ), נֶעְרַץ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (אֶרֶץ), cp. lxxxix. 8, and exeg. note.

## PSALM XLVIII.

**PENTAMETERS.** Anticipations of triumph over Israel's foes. The psalm should be read with Ps. xlv., Ps. xlvii. being inserted between them by an editorial afterthought (see introd.) ; also with Ps. lxxvi. The points of contact between xlv. and xlviii. are obvious. In ll. 1, 10, 'the city of our God' ; so xlv., l. 9. In l. 2 Yahwè's 'wondrous deeds' ; so xlv. 17. In l. 4 מִשְׁנֵב, so xlv., ll. 8, 16, 24. In l. 12 'to the ends of the earth' ; so xlv., l. 18 (sing.). In ll. 3, 13 'let mount Zion rejoice' ; so xlv., l. 9 (a synonym for 'mt. Zion'). xlviii., ll. 15 f. contain a summons to make a close inspection of the delivered city, such as is expressed more shortly in xlv., l. 17. Lastly, the idea of xlviii., l. 18a, is the same as that of xlv., l. 2 ('continually'). In fact, Ps. xlviii. expresses by anticipation the feelings of the citizens of Zion after the assault of the foes here represented by the Jerahmeelites (cp. also Ps. xlv.) has been repelled. There may possibly be an allusion to the traditional failure of the Assyrians to take Jerusalem (cp. Isa. xvii. 13 f., xxix. 7 f., xxxiii. 3, 14a, which may perhaps have suggested the description in ll. 6, 7. To suppose, however, that the psalmist is a contemporary of Isaiah would be very unnatural (see *OP*, 164). It is the pious post-exilic community which speaks ; in no other age indeed than the post-exilic did Israel assume the duty of praising Yahwè 'to the very ends of the earth' (l. 12). To the same age we are also pointed by the reference to the 'assembly' in l. 11 (cp. xxii. 23), and by the mention of the duty of handing on the Gospel of Yahwè's deliverance to the next generation (cp. xxii. 32, xlv. 2, lxxviii. 4). It has sometimes been held that this is a pilgrim-psalm (cp. *OP*, 164, 176 ; Duhm). It was hardly written with this object, though, of course, pilgrims may have used it. The key to ll. 15, 16 (which suggested the theory) is furnished by Isa. xxxiii. 17-21. There is no valid reason for separating vv. 10-15 from the rest of the psalm, which Winckler grievously misunderstands (see on l. 3).

*Marked : Of the sons of Korah.*

1

1 Great is Yahwè and highly to be praised | in the city  
of our God ;

2

His wondrous deeds [on] his holy mountain | are the  
whole earth's joy.

3

Let mount Zion rejoice and exult, | the city of the great King ;  
In the towers thereof has Yahwè | been known as a sure  
retreat.

4

For behold, those of Jerahmeel | and Arabia came together,  
When they saw its towers, they were amazed, | in confusion  
they fled.

6

Shuddering seized them and horror ; | agony as of one in  
travail ;

7

The Jerahmeelites thou didst scatter, | the tribes of Asshur.

8

Thou didst scatter the hosts of the Arabians, | O Yahwè  
Sēbāōth !

9

10 The city of our God doth Yahwè | establish for ever.

I will extol thy lovingkindness, O Yahwè, | in the midst of  
thine assembly !

10

All thy famous deeds will I publish | to the ends of the earth

11

Full of justice is thy right hand, | let mount Zion rejoice !

12

Let Judah's daughters exult | because of thy judgments !

Walk around Zion, make a full circuit, | reckon up its forts,

13

Mark well its castles, | explore its towers ;

14

Relate to the next generation | that Yahwè has brought  
deliverance,

15

Our God for ever and ever — | he +alone+ is our shield.

2. **The whole earth's joy.**

Not as in Lam. ii. 15, a title of Jerusalem.

3. The text has here greatly exercised the ingenuity of commentators. Bredenkamp (*Gesets u. Propheten*, 145) thought that 'the extreme north, the city of the great king,' could only mean Nineveh, in whose palaces the news of the overthrow of Sennacherib had produced a deep impression. Halévy (*Rev. archéol.*, juillet, '82, p. 52), that the Israelites regarded Mount Zion as a miniature of the immense world-mountain (cp. on Isa. xiv. 13) of Babylonian mythology, crowned as it

was by the sanctuary of Yahwè, and having at its feet the valley of Hinnom, the supposed entrance to the nether world. Winckler (*Gesch. Isr.* ii. 129), that the passage describes how the mountain of the north (Isa. xiv. 13) shudders at the assault made upon its angelic defenders by the 'king of contention' (מלך ריב), Yahwè (coming from the south). Yet the text is manifestly overgrown by corruption, and it should not be hopeless to cure it. See crit. note.

4. אַרְמוֹנֹת, as cxxii. 7 (only here in Pss.) ; G ἐν ταῖς βάρεσιν αὐτῆς

(*Βάρις*=בִּירָה). Jerusalem, then, was well fortified in the psalmist's time. But, he says, Yahwè was the effectual succour, not the forts. Cp. Isa. xxxiii. 18, 21.—נֹדַע, cp. lxxvi. 2.

6. תָּמָה. Cp. lxx. 9b (corr. text), Isa. xxix. 9, Hab. i. 5.—For

the flight of the enemy, cp. lxvi. 6 (corr. text).

11. Repeated xcvi. 8. The daughters of Judah (cp. lxix. 36) are the provincial towns; cp. Ezek. xvi. 48.—18. Our shield. Cp. xli. 10 (corr. text) lxxxiv. 12.

*Critical Notes.* 2. With Houb. read הָר קִדְשׁוֹ [ב]. For יָפֶה נוֹף read נִפְלְאוֹתָיו (transposing). ל dropped out; תו became פה. See on xli. 9, and note the complete consistency of the stanza. E' 'A J make נוֹף = 'a branch' (as in Mishna and T); cf. G *εὐρίζω*. So Dunash (Mt. of Olives) Gr. Herz, יָפֶה עֵנָף; cf. Ezek. xxxi. 3 (a tree is spoken of). Those who defend text compare Ar. *nâṣa* 'to tower (above), to be long, or high.' But the word has no affinities in Heb., Aram., or Ass. [Duhm retains נוֹף, and even finds here a trace of the poet's knowledge of Greek; cf. καλλικολώνη.]

3. M הֶרֶצִיּוֹן יִרְבְּתִי צִפּוֹן. Is this a reference to the northern mountain of the Elohim? See *OP*, 317, and *Enc. Bib. s.v.* 'Congregation, Mount of.' But how can 'the recesses of the north' be equivalent to 'a mountain like that mythic one in the far north'? Hence formerly (1888) I supposed that the words were the gloss of a scribe, who inserted in the margin two words from Isa. xiv. 13. But יִרְבְּתִי צִפּוֹן is simply קִרִית צִיּוֹן, a variant to הָר צִיּוֹן, which has probably supplanted יִשְׁמַח וְתִגַּל. The latter words were misplaced, and had become illegible. Read הֶרֶצִיּוֹן וְתִגַּל; cf. *ll.* 13f.

5 f. Read הֵמָּה רָאוּ כֵן.—M בִּי־הֵנָּה יִרְחֲמֵעָאִלִים וְעֶרְבִים נֹעְדוּ. Not one word is free from difficulty. הֵמָּה, but why a demonstrative? רָאוּ; but what did they see? Herz, רָאוּךְ; Lag. בָּאוּ. כֵן, to express the synchronizing of two circumstances (*Ges.-Kau*, § 164b, n. 1). But this would have been sufficiently done by an asyndeton. The style is wooden. Read אֶרְבִּינִתִּיהָ רָאוּ יַחֲדוֹ (v. 5, end) contains elements of אֶרֶם.

7 ff. M שָׁם. Read וְשָׁמָּה. Herz, שָׁמָּה, with חָלוּ for חָלִיל. In l. 8 אֲנִיּוֹת תַּרְשִׁישִׁי has caused much perplexity. Duhm thinks that Tarshish ships are mentioned, because the writer had found them in Isa. ii. 16, and inferred that they must have some cryptic reference to Jerusalem. Sharpe (*Hist. of the Hebr. Nation*, 131) sees an allusion to the destruction of the Tyrian ships which carried supplies to the Assyrian army before Pelusium (cp. Herod. ii. 141). Others take 'ships of Tarshish' to be an allegorical phrase (cp. Isa. xxxiii. 21). All most



\*unnatural. With regard to Isa. ii. 16 see *Crit. Bib.* It is true, בְּרוּחַ קָדִים is only less suspicious; קָדִים has the 'east wind' to do here? If a storm were introduced בְּרוּחַ, would the description be so condensed? Read probably יִרְחַמְאֵלִים פְּוֶרֶת אֲמוֹת אַשּׁוּר. So Isa. lx. 9. תְּרִישׁ is most easily explained as a development of אַשּׁוּר, Asshur = Ashhur or Geshur. See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Tarshish,' and crit. n. on iii. 8.—9 f. M בְּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְנוּ כִּן רָאִינוּ בְּעִיר. Very prosaic. The Pasek warns us to criticize. The key to the problem is in the first two words. כֹּאשֶׁר שִׁבְרַת מַחֲנוֹת is the editor's reconstruction of a corruption of שָׁמַעְנוּ שִׁבְרַת מַחֲנוֹת. כִּן רָאִינוּ is his reconstruction of a corrupt יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. We have here a case of the rhetorical figure Anadiplosis (cp. Kön., *Styl.*, pp. 300 ff.), but בְּעִיר = עִיר (עִירִים) is probably more correct than 'ירח', and פְּוֶרֶת should probably, as in *l.* 8, be restored for שִׁבְרַת.—For the second בְּעִיר read עִיר. The סֵלָה in *v.* 9 (end) comes from עֵלָם (dittographed).

11. M דְּמִינִי. G ὑπελάβομεν; Σ εικάσαμεν; J aestimavimus. See Isa. x. 7 (|| חֲשַׁב), xiv. 24 (|| יַעֲזֵן). So Num. xxxiii. 56, Judg. xx. 5, 'to mean, purpose.' Clearly wrong. Gr. doubtfully קִינִי. But the speaker's tone is not that of waiting expectation. An easier change too is desirable. Read אֲרוֹמִם (ם = נו), and of course יְהוָה.—M בִּקְרֹב הִכְלִךְ; a superfluous statement. G ἐν μίσῳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου (? Herz vaou). Read קִהְלֶךְ; see xxii. 23.

12. M כִּן תַּחֲלֹתָ אֵל בְּשִׁמְךָ. How unnatural! שִׁמְךָ is as certainly corrupt here as in cxxxviii. 26. We require a verb, || אֲרוֹמִם. Read אֲשַׁמִּיעַ כְּרִיתָ אֱלֹהִים (from *l.* 11). This suits עַל-קִינִי (rather אֵל or עַד); see Isa. xlviii. 20. כִּן for כָּל offers no difficulty. The initial כ in כִּשְׁמֹךְ has *not* arisen out of א; as in the corresponding case in *l.* 11 the initial א of the verb was lost. Then, to make sense, the editor prefixed כ. The final כ, however, has no doubt arisen out of ע (cp. עַל for כָּל). [Perles, *Anal.* 62, בְּשִׁמְךָ.]

16. M לְחִילָה; Pasek precedes. Softened Mappik before פ (Ges.-Kau., § 91c)? But there is strong authority for חִילָה. The chief difficulty, however, is in חִיל; G εἰς τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῆς; Σ εἰς τὸν περιβόλον αὐτῆς. The moderns follow Σ, but this gives no parallel to אֲרַמְנוֹתֶיהָ; חִיל and חֻמָּה would have been satisfactory (Isa. xxvi. 1, Lam. ii. 8). Read הִכְלִיחָה (same error as in cxxii. 7a, and perhaps in Zech. ix. 4).—M פָּסְגִי. Ludovicus De Dieu, 'walk between the palaces in all directions.' This implies deriving from פָּסַג 'to divide'; cp. M H פָּסַג 'to cut across (a vineyard, where there is no road). Read חֲפָשׁוּ (1 K. xx. 6).

17. For *לְמַעַן תִּסְפָּרוּ* read *סִפְּרוּ* (metre). *לְמַעַן* comes from a dittographed *אֶרְמַנַּת*.—M *כִּי יִהְיֶה*, with Pasek. *יִהְיֶה* 'such a one'? So at least Hitz., Del.; cp. xxiv. 6, Job xiv. 3. But no description of Yahwè has preceded. For the solution see xxii. 31 f. The subject of the message to posterity is that 'Yahwè has delivered.' Read certainly *כִּי יִהְיֶה יְהוָה*, though G omits *אלהים*.

18. M *יִנְהַגְנִי*. This does not suit the parallelism. Read, with Gr. (alt.), *מִנְהַגְנִי*. See exeg. n., and observe that the figure of the shield is Korahite.—M appends *עַל-מוֹת*, 'to death'?—'beyond death'? Most unsuitably. G read *עַל־מוֹת* (*ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος* [B]; *αὐτὸς ποιμανεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* [A]; *αὐτ. π. ἡ. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* [ART]). But *עַל־מוֹת* must originally have stood at the end of xlix. 1; it was supplied in the margin of the archetype, and intruded into the text of xlvi. 15. *עַל־מוֹת* comes from *שַׁלְמַת* 'Salmath'; prefix *לְ*. 'Of Salmah' should stand in the title of Ps. xlix.

## PSALM XLIX.

**TRIMETERS.** Verses 1–5, as read in M's text, apparently stand apart from the rest of the psalm. They have the disadvantage of exposing the psalmist to the charge (see Duhm, p. 141) of causeless grandiloquence. What follows is indeed of much importance for pious Jews, but is too directly concerned with Jewish circumstances to claim the attention of all peoples and all classes. There is, however, a strong probability that vv. 1–5 consist partly of a quatrain re-written by the editor, partly of a newly-composed passage suggested by lxxviii. 2, and that the original first quatrain or stanza of the psalm was an address to the Edomite enemies of the Jews in the spirit of the warning in ii. 9, and designed ostensibly to move them to a change of course. It is far too startlingly explicit in its accumulation of descriptive terms, but certainly forms an effective introduction, and the unexpected discovery of it some time after the rest of the psalm had been finished, seems to the present writer to confirm the general view of the poem. The psalms most parallel to Ps. xlix. are xxxvii., lxii.<sup>(2)</sup>, and lxxiii., but the references to Jerahmeelites and Ishmaelites, to 'impious ones,' to 'deniers of God,' and 'insulters of Israel,' bring the psalm into close relation to Pss. l.<sup>(2)</sup>, lii., liii. (= xiv.), lviii., lxxxii. As to Ps. lxxiii., however, it should be noted that there is no parallel in xlix.<sup>(2)</sup> to the failure of faith which the other psalm records. The close of Ps. xvi. is also partly parallel; cp. xlix.<sup>(2)</sup>, ll. 23 f., with xvi., l. 5; xlix.<sup>(2)</sup>, ll. 25 f., with xvi. ll. 16–20.

If M's text is correct, Ps. xlix. is also precisely parallel to Enoch cii. f. These passages contain a protest against a notion of the nether world which encourages the party of the wicked rich in their oppression of the righteous poor. Just such a protest M's text supplies in Ps. xlix. 'The rich man who hews out for himself a grand sepulchre, considers that he will have a correspondingly grand resting-place in Sheol. Of punishment for his oppression of the poor he does not dream. In life and in death he will be equally the spoiled child of fortune, the heir of all such good things as are to be had. To this the psalmist is made to reply that the wicked rich man is profoundly mistaken. The relative position of his own class and of the righteous poor will be inverted. The rich man will go down to join his fathers in Sheol, but without his pomp, while the poor, upright man will

be rescued from the grasp of Sheol, and the company to which he belongs will trample on the graves of the wicked when the dawn of the greatest of days appears.<sup>1</sup>

A keen textual criticism, however, shows that this view of the meaning is not entirely correct. The contrast is not between the fate of all wicked rich men as individuals and that of all poor righteous men as individuals, but between that of all individuals in the former class without exception and that of the community of the pious at the opening of the Messianic age. Of the fate of the individual poor man nothing is said.<sup>2</sup> Whether he is to be raised from the dead, should he have died before the Messianic age arrives, and whether, in the Messianic age, the righteous man is to live as long as Methuselah and then pass gently away, or, like the pious community, to live for ever, is here left undetermined. We cannot venture to infer from the refrain in our revised text that those Jews who are not 'traitors' and 'impious ones' will be brought up, if need be, from Sheol (cp. Isa. xxvi. 19), because in Ps. ix. 18 f.—a closely parallel passage—it is evidently the class of the pious as a whole which the psalmist opposes to all individual wicked men. That later on, when individualistic aspirations began to be recognized, the psalm may have been infused with a fuller meaning, is probable enough, but the law of analogy forbids us to pick out two or three psalms, and interpret them in a sense which is plainly unsuitable for other psalms of the same group. It must also be pointed out that in xlix. 16 it is not said, 'He will take thee (the individual Israelite) from among the dead,' but 'He will take me from the land of Sheol,' *i.e.* 'He will save me from dying.'

To us it may perhaps appear strange that pious Jews should have had more definite ideas as to the fate of the wicked as individuals than as to that of the pious as individuals. But we know that those for whom the psalmists speak possessed in a high degree the quality of self-forgetfulness. It was enough for them that the community would live on, even if all its present members were to pass away, and it was an object of hope with individuals to live to share the gladness of glorified Israel in the Messianic age (cvi. 4 f.). Thus we have every reason to suppose that in xlix. 16, as well as in xvi. 10, the speaker is not any individual, but the pious community.<sup>3</sup>

The view expressed in *OP*, 381 ff., that the speaker in *z*. 16 is any and every pious Israelite, must, therefore, I fear, be abandoned, while, on the other hand, the view put forward in p. 406 of the same work that xlix. 15 refers to the punishment of the wicked in Sheol is in accordance with the most thoroughly revised form of the text. It is the justice of God which enables Jewish believers to resist the temptation to murmur at their present lot; that divine justice will be manifested in the punishment of all the wicked oppressors as individuals, and in the final deliverance and glorification of the pious community in the Messianic age. Cp. Charles (*Eschatology*, p. 74), who agrees with the author as to the penal character of Sheol, but prefers to explain *z*. 16 as an assertion of the immortality of the pious individual, in accordance with the view taken in *OP*, 381 ff. So also Duhm, pp. 146 f., who holds (again in accordance with *OP*, *l.c.*) that the psalmist had also very definite ideas as to the place to which the pious man was removed by God after death.

According to Duhm, the psalm must have been written by a man of Pharisaic tendencies, and be very late. It should be noted, however, that Duhm denies that xvi. 10 (which most will at once see to be parallel to xlix. 16) expresses the hope of immortality. All that we can say is that Ps. xlix. is of earlier date than the Wisdom of Ben Sira, for Sirach xiv. 15 is based on part of Ps. xlix. 11 (see crit. note on *ll.* 11, 12). Like so many other psalms, Ps. xlix. is influenced by the dialogues of Job, which is a better argument for a late date than that offered by Duhm. For German discussions of its contents see Olshausen, Klostermann, Hupfeld-Nowack, Smend (p. 111), Baethgen, Coblentz (p. 122). Note the two equal strophes with refrain.

<sup>1</sup> *JRL*, 236 f.; cp. *OP*, 381 f., 413 f.

<sup>2</sup> The allusion which M's text *8f z*. 10 suggests to the death of 'wise men' (*i.e.* presumably, righteous men) is not sanctioned by a keen textual criticism.

<sup>3</sup> נָפְשִׁי in xi. 1 also refers to the pious community, as an organic whole.

*Deposited. Of the sons of Korah : marked. Of Salmah.* 1

1 Hear this, all ye Edomites, 2  
Attend, all ye of Ishmael,  
Both traitors and deniers, 3  
The wicked and the impious together. <sup>1</sup>

Why should I be incensed at evil-doers, 6  
+ Or+ enraged at the prosperity of the wicked,—  
Of those that trust in their wealth, 7  
And boast of the abundance of their riches ?

Surely the wicked will be unransomed, 8  
10 No purchase-money will be given for him to God ;  
All too dear is his life's ransom, 9  
Present and bribe come short. 10

Never will he see the dawn,  
For the light of life is sealed up ; 11  
The caterpillar gnaws his treasures,  
He resigns his wealth to the swarming locust.

Their glory is a portion for the greedy locust ; 12  
Their stores for the leaping locust ;  
[The feet of sheep and] oxen  
20 Trample where stood their castles.

*Traitors will not come up from Sheol,* 13  
*The impious are destroyed in Deathland.*

This is the fate of those that deny God, 14  
The latter end of those that insult Israel.  
For ever they will be prostrate in the pit, 15  
They will seek earnestly in the darkness for daybreak ;

The pangs of Death will affright them,  
The terrors of Sheol will take hold of them,  
+But+ surely my soul God will ransom, 16  
30 From the hand of Sheol he will take me.

My mouth utters perfect wisdom, 4  
The musing of my mind is full of insight :  
I incline mine ear to +hear+ true things, 5  
I pour out right things with the lyre.

+Then+ be not thou incensed when a denier waxes rich, 17  
 When the glory of his house becomes great,  
 For none of that will he take away when he dies, 18  
 His glory will not descend in his train.

Even if he trusts in his wealth, 19  
 And boasts in the abundance of his riches,  
 To the leaping locust he will resign his treasures, 20  
 To the swarming locust his stores.

*Traitors will not come up from Sheol,* 21

40 *The impious are destroyed in Deathland.*

(Gloss in *ver.* 4 f.). *I incline mine ear*. Cp. the Arabian notion that poets are visited by *jinn*, and Plato's phrase for poets (*Phædr.*, 262) *Μουσῶν προφηταί*. The assertions in *ver.* 4 are from this point of view tolerable. 'Glory' belongs 'to him that gives wisdom' (Sirach li. 16 f.).

5 f. Cp. xxxvii. 1, lxxiii. 3.—*That trust in their wealth*, because a rich man can offer costly and abundant sacrifices, and may hope, at any rate, for a semblance of distinction in the nether world. A premature death, regarded as a divine judgment, would destroy this illusion.

9. **The wicked will be unransomed.** 'There are times, at least according to Elihu, when an angelic being can say that he has found a man's purchase-money (*כִּנְזָאֲתִי*) *נָפֶר*, Job xxxiii. 24). But this ransom, which is repentance, only postpones the last day of life. Cp. Koran, Sur. ii. 117. The unfortunate fiction of a 'brother' in M's text throws the whole passage into obscurity. The speaker (*i.e.* Israel) expresses his convictions piece-meal, and each fragment is introduced by the particle *אַף*, 'surely,' or 'nevertheless.' Surely no wicked man can escape the law of death (*l.* 5). Surely my soul God will ransom (*l.* 25).

13 f. **The dawn.** 'Blackness of darkness' (Jude 13; cp. Job x. 22) is the leading feature of Sheol. Never will light dawn on its inhabitants (contrast Isa. ix. 1, lx. 1, 2). It is not the dawn of a special day—the day which, according to Targ. Jon. (on Ex. xii. 42), will follow the fourth of the extraordinary nights—the day of Messianic deliverance.—*The light of life*. Light and life are parallel (see on xxxvi. 10).—*Is sealed up*. An allusion to Job ix. 7, 'Who commands the sun, that it rise not, and seals up the stars.'

15 f. *חֶסֶל* and *אֲרֵבָה* as lxxviii. 46; cp. Sirach xiv. 15 (based on our pas-age). See 'Locust,' *Enc. Bib.*, and crit. note.

17 f. One cannot help regretting the apparent parallel to Eccles. xii. 5, 'man goes to his everlasting house.' But the writer is really perhaps imitating Joel i. 4 (rhetorical catalogue of locusts).

19 f. Cp. Isa. v. 17. xxxv. 14.—21 f. *Traitors*, cp. ix. 18.—*The impious*, cf. xiv. 2. l. 18a (corr. text), and note that the wicked here referred to are such as denied God (*l.* 19; cp. ix. 18, l. 23a, corr. text).

26. *בְּחֶשֶׁךְ*, lxxxviii. 7, 19, cxliii. 3, Lam. iii. 6.—27 f. Cp. Job xvii. 11, 14, xxiv. 17. Here, however, the pains of Sheol appear to be referred to. See introd.

*Critical Notes.*—See crit. n. on xlvi. line 18. 1—4. The names of peoples and classes were partly corrupt when rewritten by the editor. *עַמִּים* comes from *אֲדָמִים*; *יִשְׁבִּי* (as often) from *יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים*; *בְּנֵי-אָדָם* from

בְּנִדִים (cp. on *l.* 21); מִכְחָשִׁים from בְּנִי־אִישׁ (see *l.* 23); עֵשִׂיר from חֶלֶד, נִבְלִים from אֲבִיו; רָשָׁעִים. We can now see the origin of חֶלֶד, which is, here at any rate, simply a corrupt fragment of יִרְחֲמָאִים. All the supposed occurrences of חֶלֶד need careful testing. Cp. *SBOT* (Heb.) on Isa. xxxviii. 11.

*Gloss.* M לְמַשָּׁל, חִידָתִי. Both words are difficult. 'I incline mine ear to wisdom' is intelligible, but why 'to a similitude' or a 'poem'? The contents may be suggested from on high, but the words are the poet's own. And why a 'riddle'? In the sense in which the words of the wise are חִידוֹת, it is not likely that the poem of which xlix.<sup>(1)</sup> was the prologue, was a חִידָה. The same difficulties will recur in lxxviii. 2, and the two passages need the same emendation. Read מִישָׁרִים (see Prov. viii. 6, 9) and נִכְחוֹת; and for אֶפְתָּה (too vague a word) read, not אֶפְתָּר (cp. on cxix. 130), but אֲבִיעָה (lxxviii. 2).

5 M אִירָא בִימֵי רָע; partly unsuitable, partly too vague. Bā., אִירָא, Bu. אִרְאָה (comparing lxxiii. 3). Read certainly אֶתְחַר בְּמַרְעִים (xxxvii. 1, Prov. iii. 31, Prov. xxiv. 19). Cp. on lxxiii. 3, xciv. 13.—M עֵזוֹ עֲקָבִי יִסְבֵּנִי; almost so G. At once obscure and against parallelism. Small corrections (see Gr., Bā., Du.) are therefore useless. Read וַאֲקַנָּא שְׁלוֹם רָשָׁעִים. The first two words changed places. Cp. lxxiii. 3, Prov. iii. 31, xxiv. 1, 19.

9 f. M's אַח is impossible (see exeg. n.). Six MSS. of Kenn. and de R. read אֶחָד; two of de R., אֶחָד. אֶחָד is clearly right (see *l.* 25). Houb., Ew., Bā., We., Du. agree, mostly reading יִפְדָּה. But this Nifal form is passive, and, as We. (*Skizzen*, vi. 174) remarks, requires to be followed by יָתֵן. We. has not noticed, however, that, as the connexion shows, אִישׁ is a corruption of רָשָׁע. Omit פָּדָה (dittographic).

11 f. M לְעוֹלָם וְיִחְיֶיעוֹד. נִפְשׁוּ.—M וְיִחְיֶיעוֹד. Inexplicable. Nor will any gloss-theory, nor the transposition of *vii.* 9 and 10, avail to cure the evil. Read וְיִחְיֶיעוֹד שְׁלָם וְשָׁחַד.

13 M לֹא יִרְאֶה הַשָּׁחַת. ל' in M belongs to *v.* 10a, and this has caused interminable perplexity. Independently, Duhm has also seen that ל' goes with יִרְאֶה, לֹא יִרְאֶה, but he does not suspect the deep corruption of the following lines. He renders, 'Should he never see the pit? Nay, he sees it. Wise men die; together the fool and the dull-witted perish,' &c. But what have the wise and the foolish to do here? For הַשָּׁחַת read הַשָּׁחַד. See exeg. note.

14. M **כִּי אֹר** (יראה after **חַכְמִים יָמוּתוּ** Pasek). Read **כִּי אֹר** Nif. of **הָחַיִּים יִהְיֶה** as Esth. iii. 12, viii. 8. Cp. Job ix. 7.

15. M **יֶחֶד כָּסִיל וְבָעַר יֶאֱבְדוּ**. Weak, and not to the point. Read **יֶעֱרַק כָּסִיל צְבוּרִי**. The **ח** in **כָּסִיל** fell out after **ב**, which has taken the place of **ק**; **חַד** for **עַר**, quite regularly. In **וְבָעַר**, **ע** has replaced **צ**; in **יֶאֱבְדוּ**, which represents a dittographed **צְבוּרִי**, **א** has done the same thing. **כָּסִיל** is an unfortunate word; it has been misread again and again (cix. 23, Job xiii. 28). See next note and cp. 'Locust,' *Enc. Bib.*

16. M **וְעֵזְבִי לְאַחֲרִים חֵילִם**. Again a weak statement, lacking the symbolism in which the O.T. poets never fail to enwrap the facts of sad experience. Lines 11, 12 are imitated in Sirach xiv. 15, where underneath **לִיּוּדִי גּוֹרֵל** it is easy to recognize **יֹאכֵל חֲרָגָל**. Consequently another word for 'locust' must underlie **אַחַר** in the preceding line; the required word is plainly **אַרְבֵּה**. So too here **לְאַחֲרִים** comes from **לְאַרְבֵּה**. Read **יִלּוּ**

17 f. This passage has been misunderstood owing to the plausibility of G's *οἱ τάφου αὐτῶν, i.e. קְבָרִים* ('ק' collectively; cp. ST). But a reference to the tombs as man's everlasting home does not come in well between that to the locusts and that to the sheep and oxen. In spite therefore of the almost universal consent of critics since Cappellus (not, however, including Hitzig), I conclude that we must look further; indeed, the Pasek after **בְּתִיכּוֹ** seems to indicate some worse error than a slight transposition of letters. V. 18 suggests that **כְּבוֹד** ought to come in, and Ben Sira's substitution of **חֲרָגָל** for **כָּסִיל** in his imitation of lines 11, 12, suggests that **חֲרָגָל** may perhaps be expected here. Read certainly (see next note), **בְּבָרֶם מִנֶּת לְסֻלְעָם** [י' מִסְכְּנָתָם לְחֲרָגָל]. For and **חֲרָגָל** see Lev. xi. 22.

19 f. M **קִרְאוּ בְּשִׁמוֹתַם עָלֵי אֲדָמוֹת**. This is insufficient for two lines. In 1st ed. I inserted **יִשְׁכְּחֵי אֲשֶׁר**, following Bickell; Duhm suggests **אֲבָד זְכָרָם** (ix. 7). But the description of the rich man given in M is very difficult to explain (see Ol.), and however explained is not quite suitable here. Besides, **אֲדָמוֹת** (plur.) occurs nowhere else. Read **חֲרָגָל עָלֵי אֲרָמְנוֹתָם**. **רְגֵלִי** easily fell out after **חֲרָגָל**; **תָּם**; **יִרְכְּסוּ בְּשִׁמוֹ**; **קִרְאוּ** is partly concealed under **בְּקָר** and **אֲדָמוֹת** represent **אֲרָמְנוֹת**.

21 f. Line 21 in M cannot be right. (1) It produces a bad antithesis to the parallel line. (2) The phraseology is unnatural; **יָקָר** is very uncommon; **יֵלִין** is too poetical, and the position of **בְּיָקָר** produces ambiguity. **יִבִּין** (v. 21), though adopted by Dathe and Ew. (following G S),

is a weak and inadequate though early emendation. Herz acutely suggests **אָדָם מִקְבְּרוֹ בֶּל יַעֲלוֹן**, and continues **נִמְשָׁל בְּבַהֲמוֹת בְּמוֹת נִדְמוֹ**. 'This makes *l.* 22 too long. We might, of course, omit **נִמְשָׁל** as an incorrect gloss (cp. G), but we are learning to be sceptical as to so many glosses. As to *l.* 21, the phraseology is not satisfactory; **מִקְבְּרוֹ** can hardly in such a passage be substituted for **מִשְׁאוֹל**, and instead of **אָדָם**, Herz's **יַעֲלוֹן** being clearly right, we expect some plural noun. Now it so happens that **אָדָם** sometimes arises from corruption. In correcting it here we must have regard to the 'general tenor' of the psalm. Upon the whole, it seems that **בְּנָדִים** is the best critical emendation for **אָדָם** here; **בִּיקָר**, which follows **וְאָדָם**, is probably a corruption of **בְּנָדִים**, either dittographed, or a correction of **וְאָדָם** (?). **נִמְשָׁל** [נ] almost certainly = **מִשְׁאוֹל**; the opening **נ** is dittographed. There remains for *l.* 18 only **כַּבְמוֹת נִדְמוֹ**. The former word must therefore be corrupt and represent two words. In fact, we do not expect the beasts to be mentioned here; the beasts, surely, do not go to Sheol! Read **נִבְלִים נִדְמוֹ**. Now the refrain regains its colour and appropriateness. It is the 'deniers' of God (*l.* 23) and the 'traitors' among God's people to whom this stern truth is applied.

23. M **וְהִדְרִיכֶם בְּסֵל לָמוֹ**. Wellh. and Duhm rightly see that **וְהִדְרִיךְ** here must mean 'fate,' but wrongly keep the suffix. G, however, appears to have read **זֶה דְּרַכְּכֶם מִכְשׁוֹל לָמוֹ**, which suggests that the final **מ** in **דְּרַכְּכֶם** is dittographed. **כֵּסֶל** 'folly' is suspicious; in Eccles. vii. 25 read **סָכַל** (x. 6). **בִּסְלָה**, too, in lxxxv. 9 is corrupt. Read **וְהִדְרִיכֶם מִכְשָׁל יְהוָה**, and cp. on *ll.* 1-4, 31, ix. 18, l. 23.

24. M **וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם בְּפִיהֶם יִרְצוּ סֵלָה** (Pasek after 'ואח'). Herz, **וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם בְּפִיהֶם יִרְצוּ**, 'and with their talk they conciliate others.' Wellh. and Duhm correct **וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם**. Read **וְאַחֲרֵית מִחְרָפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**. **יִרְצוּ** and **סֵלָה** represent fragments of **יִשְׂרָאֵל**.

25. M **כִּצְאֹן לְשֵׂאוֹל שְׁתּוֹ**. 'Like sheep' suits 'death tends them,' which follows presently in M. But we expect a different verb; **שְׁתּוֹ** (G *ētherto*) is clearly impossible. 'Like sheep' suggests 'they are driven.' In the Hamāsa (p. 375) a plague-stricken Arab tribe is compared to a herd of camels, whose herdsman is death, 'to whose stall they must all come home, some sooner, some later.' The emendations **שְׁתּוֹ** (cp. xlv. 26 and Prov. ii. 18, where G's *ētherto* presupposes **שְׁתָּה** [see Wildeboer]), adopted by Gr., Bā.<sup>(1)</sup>, Kau., Bevan (*J. of Phil.* xviii. 143), and **יִחְתּוֹ** (Bā.<sup>(2)</sup>, We.<sup>(2)</sup>) are therefore out of the question, unless, with We.<sup>(2)</sup>, we omit **כִּצְאֹן** as an explanatory gloss to **יִרְעֵם**, or, with Herz, transfer it to the



preceding line—resources of despair. Duhm is equally arbitrary—**לשאול שתו**, according to him, is a gloss. The truth is that, as in lxxx. 2, **כצאן** is corrupt. It is an error suggested either by **כבהמות** or by **ירעם**. The poet wrote **לנצה** (cp. *l.* 9) ; **ל** dropped out, and **נצה** became **כצ[א]** **לשאול שתו** is also corrupt. Read **יחלשו בשחת** (cp. Job xiv. 10). **יח** fell out after **ח** ; **לשו** became **לשאול**. A very pretty corruption.—M's **מות ירעם** (*G θάνατος ποιμαίνει αὐτούς*) interrupts the direct narrative. Such an 'accompanying clause' is not indeed bad Hebrew (see Kön. § 368*d*) but in the present case is destructive of the parallelism, however we may read *v.* 15*a*. Let us temporarily put it aside, and attack the problem presented by **וירדו בם ישירים** | **לבקר**, a reading which is evidently very questionable, as indeed the Pasek after '**יש**' suggests. Hu.-Now. remarks, 'This cannot mean that the righteous shall rule over the rich men in Sheol.' Yet this is just what the context suggests ; we cannot compare Mal. iii. 21, for there the context is different. Hence Street (1790) reads, **וירדו כמישרים לקבר**. 'They descend, as well as the righteous (??), to the tomb.' So too independently von Ortenberg, Klost., Abbott (*Hermathena*, Feb. 1891, pp. 171*f.*), Cheyne (*OP*, inserted note), Polenaar (*Th. Tijdschr.* 1893, p. 57), Ginsburg (*Bible*), and Duhm, except that they read **במישרים** 'smoothly' (cp. Cant. vii. 9). The objection to this is twofold. 1. To a Hebrew a 'smooth' passage to Sheol would be no curse but a blessing (Job xxi. 13), and 2. a parallel line is wanting. The error in the text lies deeper ; we have to settle the text of *ll.* 23*f.* before we can decide as to *l.* 22. Taking this preliminary as accomplished (see next note), and having regard to *ll.* 9 and 34, it is probable that we should read **וירדו במחשפים לבקר** ; in several scripts an imperfect **כ** might be mistaken for a **ר**. Wellh. adheres to MG, but relegates '**יש בם וירדו**' to the margin, as implying the later eschatology ; like Ew. and Hi. he connects **לבקר** with **וצורם** **לבלות**. Why he retains **לבקר** (weakly rendered 'soon'), is not obvious. At the close he reads **שאול זבל למו** an improvement doubtless on **ש' מזבל למו**, which is read by Lo., Ew., Hi., von Ortenb., Riehm, Abbott), while Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Duhm still more plausibly read **שאול לעולם זבל למו**. There is no safeness in such superficial emendations of a thoroughly corrupt text. See next note.

27 *f.* Combine **מות ירעם** and **וצורם**, but correct this into **יבנתום** **בלהות** and the remainder (**לבלות שאול מזבל לו**) into **ציירי מות** **שאול תאחזים**. In the first of these **ר** becomes **ב**, and **מ** becomes **ת**—no violent changes ; ' is added (restored). The key is supplied by Job xviii. 11, 14, xxiv. 17. See also Job xviii. 9, where **צמים** should perhaps

be **צירים** (*JQR*, '97, p. 578). Herz independently, **לבלהות** וצירים לשאול יובילם (cp. Job xxi. 30, 32).

30 f. **סלה** is here probably a corruption of a dittographed **שאול**.—Read **מִבְּחַשׁ אִישׁ** (see on *l.* 3).—For **אֶל־תִּתַּחַר** (*l.* 23).

35–38. *V.* 19 begins thus, **בִּי־נַפְשׁוֹ בְּחַיֵּיו יִבְרָךְ**. This is very unlike the clear style of the rest of the psalm, and the next line is even more obscure, while the reference in *v.* 20 to the 'generation of the fathers' of the wicked man, as if they had all been cut off in their sins like himself, is embarrassing. The alternating second and third persons are also very puzzling. A keen glance at the words, however, reveals the underlying original. For the key see *ll.* 3, 4. Read *ll.* 35–38 thus:—

[פִּם] כִּי בְעֶשְׂרוֹ יִבְטַח  
וּבְרַב חֵילוֹ יִתְהַלֵּל  
יַעֲזֹב [לֵ] חֶרֶל צְבוּרָיו  
[ו] מִסִּכְנֵת [יו] לְאַרְבֵּה

The accumulation of corruptions is strange, but far from unparalleled. **עַד־דָּוָר** חֶרֶל reminds us of **לָדוֹר וָדָר** in *v.* 12. **וָדָר** arose out of a transposition of the letters of **חֵילוֹ**. In **כִּי**, the **כ** is dittographed, while the **י** goes with the following **ת**. **יֵשׁ**, which follows, comes from a dittographed **יֵת**. **לך** must have been originally **לֵה** (*G* *avē*); **חֵלֵל**, with transposed letters, became **בלה**; remove the upper stroke from **ל**, and it approaches **ב** (see 2 S. xix. 1, **בבכתו** for **בלכתו**).

## PSALM L.—I.

**T** RIMETERS. The introduction to a psalm on the Messianic judgment, the rest of which has been lost. Yahwè appears; his 'lips are full of indignation' (*Isa.* xxx. 27). The nations which have said, 'Come, let us destroy them' (*lxxxiii.* 5), shall receive their sentence, not in words, but in acts. Meantime, the loyal Israelites, gathered together from all parts, will look, with calm satisfaction, at the patiently waited for retribution (*lii.* 8, *liv.* 9, &c.). According to *Ol.* and *Duhm*, the writer of *Ps.* l. makes 'much ado about nothing,' or, at least, about nothing worthy of such an elaborate 'fiction' as that in *vs.* 1–6. Not relying on the weight of his own authority, he represents the following admonitions on the right kind of sacrifice and on the right rules of human intercourse to have been uttered by the divine lips amidst convulsions of nature. This view, however, is by no means a just one. It is true that the post-exilic writers sometimes begin in a key which they are not able to preserve long (see *e.g.* *Isa.* lviii.), but such a fiasco as *Ol.* and *Duhm* suppose is surely incredible. If it is true that not a few psalms are of composite origin, why should not *Ps.* l. be included in the number? It so happens that *Ps.* lxxxi. is exactly parallel. *Vs.* 7–15 of that psalm were certainly not written as the continuation of *vs.* 1–6; in short, *Ps.* lxxxi. is composite. So also is the psalm before us, and some may even be tempted to point to the 'Selah,' at the end of *v.* 6, and again (in *G*) after *v.* 15, as favouring this view. That

Ps. 1.<sup>(1)</sup> is a psalm of the post-exilic community, which delighted in descriptions of theophanies, and lived in the constant hope of the divine judgment, can hardly be denied. The parallelism between *l.* 3 and *Lam.* ii. 15 (*Isa.* xxxiii. 17) is significant; cp. *1 Macc.* ii. 12. All these passages presuppose the post-exilic idealization of the Holy City.

*Marked: Of Asaph. Of Salmah.*

I

- 1 Yahwè speaks, the earth trembles  
From utmost east to farthest west.  
From Zion, the perfection of beauty, 2  
The glory of our God shines forth.
- Before him a fire consumes, 3  
Around him a tempest rages.  
He summons the heavens above, 4  
And the earth, in the presence of his people.
- His loyal ones gather before him, 5  
10 Those that are plightd to him assemble themselves ;  
And the heavens declare his righteousness, 6  
That he is a God of justice.

3 f. Zion idealized. See introd., and note on xlviii. 3. It is touching to see how a decided opponent of the theory of the divine origin of the sacrificial ritual still adheres to the belief in the special presence of Yahwè in Zion (against Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde*, 46, n. 2).—דּוֹפִיעַ is the usual word for theophanies, as *lxxx.* 2, *xciv.* 1, *Dt.* xxxiii. 2, but seems to be a variant to יָפִי (see crit. n.).—Cp. *l.* 4 with *Isa.* lx. 16.

7. Heaven and earth are summoned as witnesses (*Isa.* i. 2).

9 ff. The 'loyal ones' to whom God has given his *berith*, or pledge, on certain moral conditions, and who represent the true Israel, assemble to witness the divine act of judgment on their wicked oppressors. Such appears to be the true meaning. The ordinary

view, however, which presupposes M, is that the nominal members of the pious community are brought together to have their piety tested (cp. Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde im Psalter*, 37). It has to be ascertained whether they are really entitled to call themselves *hāsīdīm* (cp. *Isa.* xlviii. 1 f.), and the reference to the sacrifices with which a *berith* is in usage accompanied (עֲלִי־זֶבַח) is thought to prepare the

way for the instruction on the true nature of sacrifice which follows. Unfortunately, this instruction can by no means be said to be of the nature of a test, and the strange phrase in *v.* 5b may safely be regarded as corrupt.—*The heavens*, i.e. the heavenly ones, the angels (cp. *lxxxix.* 5). *His righteousness*, i.e. that God will do justice to his people.

PSALM L.—2.

**T**RIMETERS. A restatement of the true law of sacrifice, promulgated by Yahwè at the Exodus (*Jer.* vii. 22-24). The opening agrees with *lxxxi.* 9. The only important part of the ritual is stated to be prayer and thanksgiving—important, because alone ordained by God. Cp. on xl. 2-12, li. 3-19. It is implied that

even in the age of Ezra the gross theory of sacrifices as the food of God was still in existence. No wonder, when we read Isa. lxxv. 3 f., lxxvi. 3, passages which cannot refer solely to the Samaritans, or consider the lodgment effected by that gross theory in the later Avesta of Zoroastrianism. It should also be remembered that the efficacy of sacrificial blood in maintaining the connexion between Yahwè and Israel is distinctly implied, not only in the Levitical law, but by the late prophetic writer of Zechariah ix. 11. Note the sympathetic interest in the animal creation, which is hardly quite reconcilable with the view that after all the psalmist had no objection to animal sacrifices in themselves, but only to the gross theory which he criticizes (Duhm). The correction in l. 5 is important; the psalmist's view now becomes consistent. Cp. xl. 7, li. 18.

- 1 Hear, O my people, and I will admonish thee ; 7  
 O that thou wouldest hearken unto me, O Israel !  
 I +who speak+ am Yahwè thy God,  
 [Who brought thee up out of Egypt's land].  
 None of thy sacrifices [do I desire], 8  
 And thy burnt offerings which are continually before me ;  
 I accept no bullocks from thy house, 9  
 Nor he-goats from thy folds.  
 For mine is every beast of the forest, 10  
 10 I raise up the strong among the oxen ;  
 I know all the birds of the sky, 11  
 And the trees of the uplands are in my mind.  
 If I were hungry, I would not tell thee, 12  
 For the world is mine, and all that is therein :  
 Am I to eat the flesh of bulls, 13  
 Or drink the blood of goats?  
 Sacrifice unto God thanksgiving, 14  
 And pay to the Most High thy vows,  
 And invoke me in time of trouble, 15  
 20 I will rescue thee, and thou shalt honour me.

6. **Continually before me.**  
 עֹלֹת הַתָּמִיד, 'the continual offering,' means the regular morning and evening sacrifice of a lamb.

9-12. Cp. Ps. civ., and note the gains from textual criticism. *The trees of the uplands*, cp. Isa. xl. 16, 'Lebanon is not sufficient to burn.' שָׂדֵי = Ass. *šadû* (see 'Field,' *Enc. Bib.*).

18. 'Sacrificing' and 'vowing' have become symbolic phrases. Cp. Hos. xiv. 2 [3], a late passage, where 'so will we pay the fruit (read פְּרִי

as G S) of our lips' means 'so will we pay our vows,' and the next verse shows that the phrase simply means obedience. Bredenkamp (*Gesetz. u. Propheten* ['81], 64) and B. Jacob (*ZATW*, xvii. ['97], 273 ff.) argue at length against this view. 'To sacrifice thanksgiving' must, they think, be taken literally; זֶבַח is not and cannot be used metaphorically. There is no 'must' about the matter; B. Jacob falls into a fundamental error, both as regards this phrase and as regards Ps. l. The context must decide. See on cvii. 22, cxvi. 17.



that it is not under the protection of Yahwè (Isa. x. 6, Mic. iv. 11), having collectively broken the fundamental religious precepts (Isa. ix. 16, cp. xxiv. 5 xxxiii. 14 f.). As a class name, חַן is late (eight times in Job, once in Prov., once in a very late part of Isaiah); חֲנָף only occurs in Isa.

xxxii. 6 (late). חֲנָף a'so no doubt underlies the ἀνθρωπάρεσκος(-οι) of G Ps. liii. 6, and of the Greek Ps. Sol. iv. title, 7, 8, 19. (b) The is also rather late in use. In Jer. iii. 1, 2, 9, xxxiii. 11, Mic. iv. 11 (not Micah's), it clearly means 'to be polluted.' See also Num. xxxv. 33,

Ps. cvi. 38, Isa. xxiv. 5, Dan. xi. 32; all post-exilic. On the origin of the word, see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Hypocrite.'

6-8. Prov. xi. 9 is exactly parallel. —*Thy brother, i.e. any fellow-Israelite*; for the term 'mother,' see on li. 7. Probably, just as the person addressed is a collective person, so the 'brother' spoken of is the whole body of Jews faithful to their religion.

11 f. Cp. lxxviii. 10, 18, 56, and see crit. note.—*Ye that deny God*, a good paraphrase of נִבְלִים (see crit. note).—16. See on Ps. vii. 3, and cp. Hos. v. 14, vi. 1, xiii. 7 f.; Job xvi. 9.—17 f. See introduction.

*Critical Notes.* 1.<sup>(1)</sup> The title must be enriched at the expense of v. 1 (see next note).

1. M אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה; J, *Fortis deus dominus* (similarly 'A Σ Θ), G Θεὸς Θεῶν κύριος. But this would only be possible in prose (Josh. xxii. 22, very late). אֱלֹהִים (note Pasek) is probably a corruption of על־עַלְמוֹת, i.e. לְשִׁלְמוֹת (see on x. 1). To transfer אֱלֹהִים to line 4 (Duhm) is only possible if the opening words of v. 3 are omitted (so also We.) as the ejaculatory prayer of a pious reader.—וַיִּקְרָא אֶרֶץ. But the verb should state the consequence of Yahwè's speaking (cp. Hi.). Read וַתַּחַל הָאֶרֶץ (xcvii. 4), and for מְבֹאָה (l. 2) read מְבֹאָה (We.). —4. אֱלֹהִים הוֹפִיעַ seems to be a variant to מְכַלְלֵי־יָפִי, which may have been written indistinctly, so that a marginal note was made suggesting this alternative. The title מְכַלְלֵי יָפִי seems also to occur in the true text of Isa. xxxiii. 17 (see *SBOT, Isaiah*, Heb., *ad loc.*, and cp. Marti). For יְבֹא read כְּבֹד; omit וְאֵלֵי as a dittographed ו and for חֲרָשׁ read זָרַח.

7 f. M מַעַל. Read מַמְעַל (Houb., La., We.), and also in Gen. xxvii. 39, xlix. 25.—M לָרִין. Read לִנְגַד; more natural.

9 ff. Read לוֹ חֲסִידָיו, בְּרִיתוֹ, after G (Bi., Du.).—Point וַיִּנְיְדוּ (G, Gr., Du.).

12. M אֱלֹהִים שִׁפְט (note Pasek). Read אֱלֹהֵי מִשְׁפָּט. סֵלָה in M comes from a dittographed אֱלֹהִים.

1.<sup>(2)</sup> 3 ff. An allusion to Ex. xx. 2. Read therefore יְהוָה (which the editor avoids) for אֱלֹהִים, and supply || line by the help of Ex. xx. 2b, Ps. lxxxi. 11b.—Read [א]וֹכִיחַ; לֹא [אֲחַפֵּץ] כְּלִיזְבוּחִיד is a dittogram of

10. M's **בְּהַרֵּי אֶלֶף** has caused much perplexity. 'On the mountains of the thousand' ('A J, Bā.)? We should have expected **בְּהַרֵּי בָּשָׁן**. G *ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ βόες* = **בהרם ואלף**. Du., **בהרם אלף**, 'on a thousand hills.' Ol., Bi., We., **בהררי אל**; cp. xxxvi. 7. Critics, however, have omitted to ask whether the corruption may not extend to **בהמות** (corrupt in xlix. 13, 21, lxxiii. 22). To obtain a satisfactory sense, read **הִכְנַתִּי אֶבְיִירֵי אֲלָפִים**.

11. M **הָרִים**, a scribe's error produced by **הַרְרִי**. Read **שָׁמַיִם** (so Street and Duhm) after G S T. One MS. of Kenn. has **הַשְּׁמַיִם הָרִים**.

12. M **זֶיז שָׂדֵי** (as in lxxx. 14<sup>b</sup>), *i.e.*, according to most since Bochart, 'all that stirs in the field (or plain).' Too vague. Franz Del. compared Ass. *sisānu*, 'worms,' or (Frd. Del., *Ass. HWB*, 282<sup>a</sup>, but cp. 572), 'an animal like a locust.' Cp. also **זֶיז** 'mite, spider.' Too mean. Both here and in Ps. lxxx. the word is certainly corrupt. G here *ὠραύρης ἀγροῦ*, *i.e.* either Aram. **זֶיז** 'brightness,' Dan. ii. 31 (some MSS. read **זֶיז** for **זֶיז** in Isa. lxvi. 11), or **צִיץ** 'flower' (lit. something bright); Herz would even read **עֲצִי**. The most probable correction is **עֲצֵי** 'the trees of (the) uplands.' Cp. lxxx. 14; also *SBOT, Isaiah*, Heb., p. 165.

20. G's *διάψαλμα*, *i.e.* **סִלָּה**, comes from a dittographed **אלהים**.

1.<sup>(3)</sup> 5 f. According to M, the crimes imputed to the bad Israelites are thieving and adultery—a rather commonplace description. The language too is not natural; 'when thou sawest a thief, thou hadst pleasure(?) with him.' The use of **רָצָה** with **עַם** is also questionable (Job xxxiv. 9?); but the **וְתָרַץ** of G S J (Saad. Gr. Bā) is not very plausible. Read **עַם-עֲדַת נְבָלִים תִּצְמַד**. The initial ו in **וְתָרַץ** probably represents the ל in **נבל**; **עמו** probably comes from **צמד**, a fragment of a dittographed **תצמד**.

7 f. M **שִׁלַּחַת**, an odd expression. Read probably **לְחַשֶּׁת** **בְּפִי לְחַשֶּׁת**; that **לחש** (M H, Aram., 'to hum, to whisper') is not found in Kal, is no strong objection.—M **לְשׁוֹנֶךָ**. Read **לְשׁוֹנֶךָ** (see lii. 6<sup>b</sup>).—M **תִּצְמִיד**. Read **תוֹצֵא** (Frankenberg, *Psalmen Sal.*, 20). **מר** arose from dittography.

9 f. M **תִּשָּׁב**. Rather **בִּשְׁת**, Kr., Gr., Herz.—M **תִּתֵּן דְּפִי**; G *ἐτίθεις σκάνδαλον*; a guess? In M H **דְּפִי** = 'blemish, reproach'; cp. *Yoma* 22<sup>b</sup>, 'no reproach ('ד') rested on Saul's descent.' It occurs in Sirach xlv. 19 mg., but the text-reading (confirmed by S) is **מוֹם**. Read **תִּגְדֹּף**. **תִּגְדֹּף** generally denotes blasphemy against God, but cp. xlv. 17, and note the wider use of **גְּדוּפִים**. The construction **בְּגִדְּךָ** is Talmudic.

11. M **אֵלֶּה עֲשִׂיתִּי וְהִחַרְשְׁתִּי** (note Pasek); very obscure. It was

ot true that Yahwè 'kept silence,' *i.e.* took no notice of the offences. Nowack takes the clause to be virtually interrogative; Kön. (§ 390 r) explains, 'as often as I was silent.' Parallelism is opposed to all these; we require הַחֲרָשָׁה, which, however, will not make sense. We have no option but to seek for suitable words which, on the analogy of similar errors elsewhere, the scribe may have corrupted into 'אלה עשית והח' (for the whole clause is unnatural in form and contents). Not improbably read יהוה נִסִּיתָ וְהִכְעַסְתָּ; this prepares the way for the strong phrase in l. 15 (*v.* 22a). אלה represents אלהים (substituted by the editor for יהוה).—M דְּמִיתָ הָיִיתָ אֲהִיָּה כְמוֹךָ; G ἵπλεσθες ἀνομίαν (הַוִּוֹת) ὅτι ἔσομαι σοι ὁμοιος; "Ἄλλος gives ἄνομε. First of all, אֲהִיָּה excites suspicion; the supposition that two readings are combined is too easy, considering that, in the next place, the whole clause is neither clear in itself, nor suitably placed. How did the wicked faction suppose that God was like itself? The characteristics of the wicked of which we have just heard are incapable of being ascribed to God. Had the phrase been, 'thou thoughtest that a bribe would appease me,' we might have let it pass. What we require is a suitable climax for the list of the offences of the wicked—something equivalent to 'thou hast denied God' (*cp.* l. 15; *v.* 22a). Read probably מְרִיתָ תוֹרַת אֱלֹהֶיךָ; thus parallelism is thoroughly satisfied. The three final letters in M (מֹרֶךְ) may be added to the material for the next line.—M אוֹכִיחֶךָ (מֹרֶךְ). The general sense is clear, but the right way of expanding this scanty material is not clear. Read perhaps, עַל־מַעַלְךָ אוֹכִיחֶךָ (*cp.* Ezr. ix. 4, x. 6), if this is metrically sufficient.—After וְאֶעֱרָכָה insert דְּרָכֶיךָ. The recurrence of רכ might account for the omission.

15. M שְׂכַחֲתִי. Read certainly מִכַּחֲשֵׁי (see on ix. 18).

Appendix. The difficulties are—(1) יִכְבְּדֵנִי (double נ), (2) וְשֵׁם דָּרֶךְ (meaning), (3) the excessive length of the second line. The second of these has been met in different ways. Many (Bp. Hare, Street. Geiger (*Jüd. Zt.* v. 113), Gr., Che. (ed. 1), Kau., Bevan (*Crit. Rev.*, April, '96), Herz) read וְתִכְדְּרֶךָ; Lagarde [*Mittheil.* ii. 378], and nearly so We., מִשְׁלֵם נָדָר. Σ paraphrases M, καὶ εὐτάκτως ὀδεύοντι. The meaning of the consonants of the text, however, is probably given by G, καὶ ἐκεῖ (וְשֵׁם) ὁδὸς ἣ δέλω αὐτῷ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. But is either G's view or Lagarde's satisfactory? No; for (1) both readings are unmetrical, and (2) the payment of vows should follow and not precede the sight of Yahwè's deliverance. The three difficulties must, therefore, be met differently. Read thus (*cp.* ll. 17, 18, 20),—

יִבַּח תוֹדָה יִכְבְּדֵנִי  
וְשֵׁלֵם נְדָרֶיךָ לְעֶלְיוֹן



The second נ in יכבדנני seems to have been detached from נדר[ני]. M's addition בישע אלהים has arisen out of two miswritten forms of ושלם; cp. שלמים for אלהים in the title of Ps. l. אראנו comes from לעליון.

## PSALM LI.

**T**RIMETERS. Pious Israel, still suffering acutely from calamities which are a proof of God's wrath, but not now in exile (see on v. 13a), craves pardon for sins which it cannot indeed fully understand, but which it assumes to be as great as the punishment. The author of the appendix supposes the psalm to have been written during the exile, for in the prayer, 'Build the walls of Jerusalem' (v. 20b), he throws himself back imaginatively into this period. In other words, this later writer wishes to add a qualification to a passage (v. 18) liable, as he thought, to be misunderstood, but not to frame it in such a way as to spoil the harmony of the composition. Another writer, to whom v. 2 must be assigned, so entirely missed the object of the psalmist that he picked out a scene in the life of a historic personage which seemed to him to present the occasion of the psalm. The lateness of his date, however, is sufficiently shown by the fact that this historic personage is David, whose name only got into the original title (v. 1) by corruption of the text (the psalm being really Ethan's). The acquaintance of the psalmist with Isa. xl.-lxvi. is a cogent proof that he too is by no means an early writer; at any rate, he cannot be placed earlier than the close of the Persian period. To suppose a reference to the colossal troubles commonly (but perhaps wrongly) assigned to the times of Artaxerxes Ochus is hazardous, however. The poet seems rather to sum up all the many troubles of the period which began with the fall of Jerusalem, and never actually ended till the great Maccabees arose.

That the speaker is the pious community is beyond reasonable doubt. To suppose that the psalm was originally meant for an individual, but afterwards adapted to the use of the community, or that the psalmist is not quite sure himself whether he would prefer the speaker to be an individual, or to represent Israel (cp. Coblenz, p. 85), needlessly impairs the harmony and consistency of the poem. The Hebrew writers so strongly realize the organic unity of Israel that they fall into the use of language which is sometimes startling to Western readers (see on xxxii.<sup>(1)</sup> and cp. Isa. liii.). The expression 'deliver me from bloodshed' (v. 16a) is quite capable of explanation on the nationalistic theory. To the innocent blood which was shed by Manasseh (2 K. xxiv. 3 f.; cp. Ezek. vii. 23, xvii. 2-4) the captivity of Judah is expressly assigned, and it can be shown that that old Semitic passionateness which led to sins of bloodshed was by no means purged away from the later Jews (see e.g. xxvi. 9, lix. 2, cxxxix. 19, Isa. lix. 3, 11,<sup>1</sup> and note that the whole of Isa. lix. is like a commentary on Ps. lix.<sup>(1)</sup> But it is more than probable that מרמים is corrupt (see on l. 29), so that the long dispute between the friends and the foes of the Davidic authorship loses its chief starting-point.\*

It is true there is another starting-point—the title. Can the circumstantial statement in v. 2 really have been woven out of the obscure words, 'Rescue me from bloodshed'? Probably the title can be accounted for on a quite different theory. On the analogy of Pss. vii. and lii., it would seem that v. 2 is an editorial expansion of the misread words 'to Bathsheba,' and it is possible that the psalm was originally described as a Sabbath-psalm (see crit. n. on title).

*Deposited. Marked: of 'Arab-ethan. For the Sabbath (?)*. 1, 2

- 1 Have pity upon me, O God! according to thy great kindness; 3  
Thy compassion being so large, blot out my transgressions.  
As with fullers' soap wash me from my guilt, 4  
And purify me from my sin.

<sup>1</sup> *Aids to the Study of Criticism*, 207-210.

- My transgressions I do indeed acknowledge, 5  
Of my sins I am ever conscious.
- Against thee alone have I sinned, 6  
Displeasing to thee +alone+ is that which I have done,  
That thou mightest be +proved+ righteous in thy sentence,  
10 That thou mightest be +proved+ blameless in thy judgment,  
Surely in guilt was I brought forth, 7  
In sin did my mother conceive me.
- Surely thou carest for truth more than for offerings, 8  
Make me, then, to know the secrets of wisdom.  
Besprinkle me with hyssop, that I may become pure ; 9  
Wash me, that I may become whiter than snow ;  
Satisfy me with mirth and gladness, 10  
That the frame thou hast crushed may thrill with joy.
- Hide thy face from my sins ; 11  
20 My guilty acts—blot them all out.  
A pure heart create for me, O God ! 12  
A constant spirit produce within me.  
Cast me not forth from thy presence ; 13  
Thy holy spirit take not from me.
- Gladden me again with thy succour, 14  
And sustain me with a zealous spirit.  
Then will I teach thy ways to apostates, 15  
So that sinners return to thee.  
Rescue me from the Edomites, O Yahwè ! 16  
30 That my tongue may cause to resound thy righteousness.
- O Yahwè ! open my lips, 17  
That my tongue may publish thy praise.  
For thou carest not for sacrifices, • 18  
Offerings and burnt sacrifices thou dost not desire.  
Yahwè's power is a spirit that is broken, 19  
A heart that is<sup>2</sup> crushed<sup>3</sup> thou dost not despise.

*Appendix.*

- Be pleased to show kindness to Zion, 20  
Build thou Jerusalem's walls.  
Then wilt thou care for the right sacrifices ;  
40 Then will bullocks be brought to thine altar.

<sup>1</sup> My succouring God.<sup>2</sup> Broken and.<sup>3</sup> O God !

3. **כִּנְיָ, G**  $\Sigma$   $\pi\lambda\upsilon\nu\nu\nu$ . The same figure in Jer. iv. 14, Mal. iii. 2.—6. 'in my consciousness' (l. 8).—

7. *Against thee alone, i.e.* not against the Babylonians (Theod. of Mop.) or any other human party in the cause. Cp. Hab. i. 4, 13, Isa. xxxiii. 1. Why against Yahwè? This is inferred from the national calamities.

9. **That thou mightest, &c.** The 'sentence' or 'judgment' has been declared in Israel's recent history; Babylon (?) and Persia have executed it as God's instruments. The successes of these earthly powers were fore-ordained (cp. Isa. xxxvii. 26 f.). If so, the rightness of these successes (so harmful to Israel) had to be proved, and Israel had to sin that no shadow of blame might rest on Yahwè (cp. Isa. lxiii. 17).

11. **In guilt, &c.** The speaker belongs to an erring race. Cp. Job xiv. 4 (even if an interpolation<sup>1</sup>), Isa. xlviii. 8, Ezek. xvi. 8. The 'mother' means the race; cp. xxii. 10 f., l. 20, lxxi. 6, Isa. l. 1.

13 f. Israel has made its confession; it may now look for a cheering response (xxxii. 5, Hos. xiv. 2-4 [3-5]). But to show that its penitence is not superficial, a further petition is added. Israel knows that obedience is the true sacrifice, and that the first step in the path of obedience is confession of sin. For each further step special wisdom or insight is required, i.e. ability so to frame one's conduct as to please Yahwè. God alone can give this wisdom, the secrets of which are 'marvels' (Job xi. 6). Hence, the speaker adds, since *thou carest for truth* (i.e. sincerity, cp. cxlv. 18, 1 K. ii. 4) *more than for offerings* (xl. 7)—and I have given a first proof of 'truth' by my free confession—*make me to know those secrets*. In Ps. xc. a prayer for pardon and a prayer for wisdom and for joy are again combined.

14. **Besprinkle me;** lit. 'free me from sin,' G,  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . Notice that Heb. סִלַּח 'to pardon' = Ass. *salāhu* 'to besprinkle.' As in Ezek. xxxvi. 25, one of the traditional rites is interpreted symbolically. Possibly the symbol implies the comparison of the nation to a

leper (cp. Isa. liii. 4b).—*Wash me, &c.* Cp. Isa. i. 18, Job ix. 30. For the idea, cp. Jer. ii. 22, xiii. 23.

18f. **Thou hast crushed** (רָכַיִת), pointing on to l. 36. Cp. xxxviii. 9, xlv. 20.

21 f. Clément Marot finely renders, 'O Créateur, te plaise en moy créer | Un cœur tout pur, une vie nouvelle.' For the key to the meaning see Ezek. xi. 19 f., xviii. 31, xxxvi. 26 f., where a 'new heart' or a 'heart of flesh' is promised to Israel, so that he may walk straight forward in God's ways. To render **לֵב טָהוֹר** 'ein lichte; Bewusstsein' (Hitz.), or 'a joyous spirit' (Wellh.), is therefore impossible. Hitz. appeals to Prov. xxii. 11a, but the omission of י' (= יְהוָה) in v. 11a, and the loss of יֵב (cp. G) have obscured the meaning of that passage. It is 'one who is pure in heart' that Yahwè loves, and this is a synonym of 'blameless' (ἄμωμος) in b. It is not merely a joyous heart, or a temporarily 'clean' heart, that the speaker desires. A 'clean heart' had often been subjectively possessed for a time by the early Israelites, after the due performance of sacrificial rites. It is a heart, not only clean, but able to guard itself against future pollution which is sought for; **נָרָא** is therefore the right word, and **חָדָשׁ** is its synonym. Such a 'new heart' is described as **רוּחַ נָכוֹן**, which is not merely a courageous, confident spirit = **לֵב נָכוֹן** (lvii. 8, cxii. 7), but a steady impulse towards all that is good = **רוּחַ נְרִיבָה** (l. 26). If there is any doubt about this, lxxviii. 8, 37 ought to remove it. Cf. on cii. 19.

23. **Cast me not forth . . .** 2 K. xxiv. 3 says, 'By Yahwè's commandment came this upon Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh.' It is first of all exclusion from the land of Canaan which is thought of. But such exclusion is chiefly painful because it means the cessation of the privileges of worship in the temple—the house, not so much of sacrifice, as of prayer. Even if a new

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *J.Q.R.*, '97, p. 577.

conception of God's presence is being formed (see on xxiii. 6), it cannot as yet supplant the sublime and tender associations of the material temple. And how is the right of access to God's presence to be preserved? Only by righteousness (v. 6, 8), and persistent righteousness can only be had through the *holy* (or divine) *spirit* dwelling

within Israel. The workings of this spirit are seen (1) in the right guidance of the people of Israel (Isa. lxiii. 10, 11, 14) and (2) in the right religious teaching of Israel (Neh. ix. 20). Both kinds of operation are implied here; the former in lines 25, 29, the latter in lines 14, 27.—39. *The right sacrifices*, legally right. See on iv. 6.

*Critical notes.* Title. The statement in v. 2 is perhaps an expansion of אֱלֹהֵי-שֶׁבַע, for which, however, we should perhaps read אֱלֹהֵי-שֶׁבַת, omitting all the rest of v. 2. See introd., and cp. on lii. 2.

1. M כְּחֶסֶדְךָ. G κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου, i.e. כְּגִדְלֶךָ (Num. xiv. 19), which Bi. restores. Note parallelism, and cp. lxxix. 11, כְּגִדְלֶךָ וְרִנָּתְךָ. (יה) is absorbed by חֲנֻנִי; thus the line is still a trimeter. כְּרִבְרַחְמֶיךָ in L. 2 presents one beat.

3. M הֶרְבָּה (Kt.) or הֶרֶב (Kr.). Superfluous and unpicturesque. Read פְּבִרִית (Jer. ii. 22, Mal. iii. 2). Grätz, who reads הֶרֶב (פְּשָׁעִי), sees the problem, but not the solution.

9 f. M בְּדִבְרֶךָ, to produce an assonance with בְּשִׁפְטֶךָ. Rather point בְּדִבְרֶךָ, but as the sing. (S), not the plur. (G Σ J). In L. 10 read (Gr.). G ἐν τῷ κρῖνεσθαι σε :

13 f. The rendering of this distich given in the Wellhausen-Furness Psalter is so remarkable that I give it here.

Yea, faith and trust—it is these that thou lovest.

Grant me, then, insight into the mystery.

The accompanying note runs thus,—‘It troubles him to be obliged to acknowledge God's righteousness without understanding the reason therefor. If he could but get an “insight into the mystery” his faith would be strengthened (cp. xc. 8).’ In the following note it is further stated that ‘by the “clean heart” is meant a joyous spirit, assured of the divine favour (v. 12). The opposite to this is the troubled, not the impure heart.’ This is partly the same as the view of Hitzig, who, like We., explains ‘a pure heart’ (לֵב טָהוֹר) as = ‘a consciousness untroubled by the loss of communion with God,’ but supposes the ‘hidden thing’ (סֵתֶם) to be Israel's uncertain future. Both take אֶמֶת to be a synonym of אֱמוּנָה in the sense of πίστις, and בְּטָחוֹת (Job xii. 6 ἄπ. λεγ.) in the similarly subjective sense of ‘trust’; of the latter rendering, however, We. indicates the doubtfulness. The explanation is in a high degree forced, but it expresses a needed protest against the traditional view. A middle position is taken up by Bā. His version is,—

Truly thou hast pleasure in firmness of heart,  
Therefore make known wisdom to me inwardly.

That is, he agrees with the traditionalists that **טחת** and **סתם** are both designations of the inner man, but he admits that **טחת** at any rate is as yet philologically obscure. He is also dissatisfied with the common explanation of **אמת** as sincerity or honesty, and discovers a new and subtle sense for it—‘das fest in Gott gegründete Wesen (1 K. ii. 4).’ My own position is this. If the generally received view of the sense of *l.* 13 f. is right, **בטחות** and **בסתם** must contain designations of two of the inner parts of the body; they must be equivalent to **בלב** and **בכליות** (see references in note on vii. 9). Unfortunately there is no philological means of proving this. It is mere trifling to say that the ‘reins’ are called **טחות**, because ‘smeared over’ with fat, and in Job xxxviii. 36, where the same sense is given to **ב[טחות]** by Tg. and the Rabbins, we should certainly read **תרתח**, the ‘lance-star,’ Antares (cf. on lv. 22). The sense ‘secret place,’ = ‘heart,’ for **סתם** is less arbitrary, but still not probable. The word only occurs once elsewhere in plur. for ‘secret’ (Dan. xii. 9), and there **סתמים** is explained by **חתמים** ‘sealed’; **כל-סתם** in Ezek. xxviii. 3 is doubtless corrupt (Cornill; *Crit. Bib.*). Now let us turn to G. This version makes sense by disregarding the two **ב**,—*ἰδὸν γὰρ ἀληθείαν ἡγάπησας, τὰ ἀδελὰ καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῆς σοφίας σου ἐδήλωσάς μοι*. Apart from the wrong tense, this gives probably the right meaning of *l.* 14 (see above). But we cannot ignore the two **ב**, and our experience both with **טחות** and with **סתם** warns us to look out for corruption of the text. Assuming G’s view of the general meaning, there is only one word from which **סתם** can have sprung; it is **תעלמות** (xliv. 22, Job xi. 6, xxviii. 11), which was perhaps G’s reading (cf. G, xliv. 21). And how shall we correct With sound linguistic perception MT recognizes in the initial **ב** a preposition. But if G’s view of *l.* 14 is correct, the required preposition is **מן**; ‘thou carest for sincerity more than for’ anything which can be done with formal accuracy without sincerity. Now we can see what is required. Comparing lines 33 f., xl. 7, and especially Hos. vi. 6b, we may with a near approach to certainty restore **ממנחות**; the corruptions and omission implied were easy.

18. **תשביעני** (S, Bruston, Bā.). M **תשמיעני**. Unnatural. It is the psalmist who is to sing aloud.

29. M **מדמים**. Read **מאדמים** (see on v. 6, lv. 24).

34. **ומנחה** (cf. on *l.* 13), M **ואתנה**. After **מנחה** had been miswritten **מחנה**, it was easy to correct **מח** into **את**. Perles (*Anal.* 88), **ומתנה**. Duhm **ואתנה**, as the protasis to *v.* 18 b, i.e. ‘and were I to give burnt offerings.’ This, however, is not natural. By reading  
we make lines 33 and 34 quite symmetrical.

## PSALM LII.

**TRIMETERS.** A prophetic denunciation of the Jerahmeelite people as a leading element in the 'league' of the 'impious,' with which, as we gather from some of the psalms (e.g. xxvi., l.<sup>(3)</sup>) a Jewish faction was associated. The psalm is parallel to others in which the sharp tongues of the Arabian enemies are spoken of (cp. e.g. lv. 22, lix. 8, lxiv. 4, cxx. 4)—parallel also to that strange 49th psalm in which the 'traitors,' the 'impious,' the 'deniers of God,' the 'insulters of Israel,' are condemned to everlasting confinement in Sheol, while the true Israel—the community of pious observers of Yahwè's Law—will live for ever in the enjoyment of God's favour. Both in Ps. xlix.<sup>(2)</sup> and in l's. lii. it is characteristic of the opponents of this true Israel that they trust in their riches rather than in the one true God—that All-righteous One, who is not to be bribed by costly sacrifices to protect or to favour immoral deniers of his Law and insulters of his faithful servants. The Jerahmeelites or N. Arabians, then, would appear to be primarily meant in Ps. xlix.<sup>(2)</sup> Our psalm supplies just that historical definiteness which is required to make Ps. xlix.<sup>(2)</sup> thoroughly intelligible. Not only are individual wicked men—whether of Jewish or Jerahmeelite origin—to be hurried off to Sheol, leaving their ill-gotten wealth to the locust, but the whole Jerahmeelite community in Palestine is soon to meet with a violent end, presumably at the coming judgment. The vehement language of v. 7 casts a bright light on l. 22, where 'tearing in pieces' relates especially to the destruction of the Jerahmeelites as a community (cp. ii. 9). On the 'league of the impious' (l. 1) see xxvi. 4 f., l. 18, lxxxii. 1 (cp. lviii. 2). The psalm seems to have suggested Ps. iv. in the Psalter of Solomon, which is a Pharisaic attack on the Sadducees. Cp. *OP*, 121. It has also a singular resemblance to Isaiah's diatribe against a certain Cushite or Jerahmeelite *parvenu* at Jerusalem, whom the prophet threatens with expulsion from Judah (Isa. xxii. 15-18). See *Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, v. [1901], 442 ff.

*Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan. Against the house of Jerahmeel.* 1, 2

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 1  | Why ragest thou in the league of the impious,     | 3 |
|    | [And insultest,] O Jerahmeel, continually ?       |   |
|    | Insults dost thou plan for thy neighbours,        | 4 |
|    | Thy tongue is like a whetted razor.               |   |
|    | Thou lovest tricks and falsehoods                 | 5 |
|    | More than words of righteousness and peace ;      |   |
|    | Thou lovest all words that destroy,               | 6 |
|    | To thy neighbours [thou utterest] deceit.         |   |
|    | Therefore God will pluck thee up for ever,        | 7 |
| 10 | Will seize thee and tear thee up, O Jerahmeel,    |   |
|    | * * * *   |   |
|    | And from the land of the living will uproot thee. |   |
|    | The righteous will see it, and will triumph,      | 8 |
|    | [They will rejoice,] and will laugh at his fate,  |   |
|    | 'Behold, the impious one [who raged,]             | 9 |
|    | Who made not Yahwè his stronghold,                |   |
|    | But trusted in the abundance of his wealth,       |   |
|    | And exulted in the glory of his house.'           |   |

And as for me, bowed <sup>+</sup>by suffering<sup>+</sup> and poor,

10

20

\* \* \* \*

I take refuge in the goodness of Yahwè,

I trust in the lovingkindness of my God.

I will thank thee for ever, because thou hast delivered, 11

And will sing praise, for thy lovingkindness is good.

1 f. See introd. *Insultest* . . *continually*. Cp. xlii. 11, xlv. 17, lxxiv. 10 (corr. text). The 'insult' is, 'Where is thy God?'—4. Cp. lv. 22, lix. 8.—5. מְרִמּוֹת x. 7, xxxv. 20, xxxviii. 13; שְׁקָרִים, ci. 7.—7. בְּלִיעַל.

See on xviii. 9—12.—9—12. See on ii. 9, and cp. Isaiah's threat, Isa. xxii. 17 f.; also Ps. xxxvii. 35 f.

16. **Who made not Yahwè, &c.** Cp. liv. 5 c, 'they have not set thee, O Yahwè! before them.' The religion of the Jerahmeelites, being low and formal, is worthless. They know not the 'right sacrifices,' iv. 6 (see note).

17 f. See introd. and cp. xlix. 7.—

19. Most scholars find a contrast between the luxuriant olive-tree planted in the temple-courts, and therefore specially flourishing, and the uprooted tree which symbolizes Israel's enemy. But (1) the description of the olive-tree is singularly cramped, and (2) to infer from lxxiv. 4, xcii. 14, Zech. i. 8, and 2 Macc. xiv. 4 that trees grew in the sacred precincts in ancient times, is excessively bold. None of these passages will bear the stress laid upon them. The contrast is a finer one than has been supposed; it is between the proud self-confident Jerahmeelite and the humble Israelite, whose refuge is Yahwè's lovingkindness.—23. *Thou hast delivered*. Strictly, a future perfect (cp. liv. 9, lvi. 14).

*Critical Notes.* Title. The reference of the title to Doeg the Edomite is so absurd that one looks out for a motive. The motive is a misunderstanding of the (probably) true title, viz. עַל-בֵּית יִרְחֻמָּאֵל, which was misread אֶל-בֵּית אֲחִימֶלֶךְ, and set the editor thinking how to expand it.

1. M הַנְּבוֹר, enigmatical. And why בָּרַעָה? To suit בְּתַהוֹל? But does any one 'boast' of his 'wickedness'? In the light of parallel psalms read certainly בְּקֶשֶׁר הַנְּבָל. בְּתַהוֹל. For other disguises of נבל see xxvi. 4, lviii. 2, lxxxii. 1. רַעָה comes from a corrupt form רַגְשָׁת (lxiv. 3). For תַּת, see the error in x. 3, and cp. on lxviii. 22.—2. For אֶל הָסֵד Houb., We., and Du. (after S) ingeniously read אֶל-חֲסִיד. But the corruption of יִרְחֻמָּאֵל into חֲסִיד in xliii. 1 suggests a better correction. Read יִרְחֻמָּאֵל (vocative), and prefix וַתְּחַדֶּרָה. See exeg. note.—3. M הָיוּ. Too strong; read חֲדָפוֹת. See on v. 10, and cp. on lxii. 4. 3.

3. M לְשׁוֹנֶךָ (so G). Does the tongue think? xxxv. 28 is no justification. Read לְשׁוֹנֶיךָ. Same error in xv. 3; cp. on 4. 8.

4. M עֲשֵׂה רַמְיָה. The true reading is לְשׁוֹנֶךָ, but when this word had come by corruption into 4. 3, the ancient editor had to emend

it in *l.* 9. A reminiscence of *ci.* 7 may have suggested the alteration ; cp. also *l.* 8. Thus once more the gloss-theory is superfluous.

7. M בָּלַע, nowhere found as a noun. Read בְּלִיעַל (cp. *lviii.* 3, corr. text). [So already Brüll.]

8. M לִשְׁוֹן מְרֻמָּה. Read לִשְׁכֵּנִיד תִּצִּיא מְרֻמָּה (see on *l.* 3). The line now coincides with *l.* 19*b* (corr. text).

10. M יִחְתֶּדָּה. But חתה means 'to rake, or hold, together.' We would derive from חתת. Read rather יִחְטָפֶדָּה (*x.* 10, *Judg.* *xxi.* 21). ת for ט as *Job* *ix.* 12, *Prov.* *xxiii.* 28 (read חתת).—M מֵאָהֶל. A suffix is required ; Σ *S* Houb. supply 2 m. s. ; *Gr.* *Dyo.* 3 m. s. But many analogies suggest that the true reading is יִרְחֶמְאֵל (see on *l.* 2). The סלה at the close of *v.* 7 represents the same word (a marginal correction of סֵלָה?).

13 *f.* M וַיִּירָאוּ. Read either וַיִּרְעִינוּ (*xli.* 12) or (xl. 4*b*?) וַיִּנְהָרוּ. *S* (very paraphrastic in this verse) 'shall rejoice.'—Read וַעֲלִיו [וַשְׁמְחוּ]. וַיִּשְׁחָקוּ. The two verbs look very much alike ; hence one fell out.

15. M הִנָּבֵר. Read הִנָּבֵל (see on *l.* 1), and insert הַמַּתְהַלֵּל.

17. M יַעֲזוּ בִּבְהוֹתוֹ. Plainly a mutilated phrase. Read יַעֲזוּ בִּבְכּוֹד (xlix. 17). *G* ἐδυναμώθη ἐπὶ τῇ ματαιότητι αὐτοῦ, *i.e.* יַעֲזוּ בִּבְהַבְלוֹ (xlix. 17). *S* *T* presuppose בִּבְהוֹנוֹ, which *La.*, *Gr.*, *Bi.*, *Bä.*, *Du.* adopt. *Herz*, יַעֲזוּב בִּבְהוֹתוֹ. *M*'s ותו is a fragment of בִּיתוֹ ; for יַעֲזוּ, see *ix.* 20 (corr. text).

19 *f.* M וְאֲנִי בֵּית רַעְנָן (*Pasek* after וְאֲנִי). Very improbable (see *exeg.* note). כוֹיֹת is a corruption of חֲסִיתִי, which is indispensable as a parallel to בְּמַחֲתִי, and is misplaced. רַעְנָן is again corrupt in xxxvii. 35. Read here וְאַבְיֹן, and prefix עֲנִי, which fell out after אֲנִי. The next line is wanting.

21. Read חֲסִיתִי בְּטוֹב יְהוָה (parallelism). טוב and בֵּית con-founded (*liv.* 8).—22. Omit עוֹלָם, a corrupt dittogram of אֱלֹהִים, and ועד as a dittogram of אֹד in אֹדֶד. But אֱלֹהֵי is preferable to אֱלֹהִים.—23. M עֲשִׂיתָ. Read הוֹשַׁעְתָּ (see on *xxii.* 31).

24. M אֶקְרָה. *Hu.*, אֶסְפָּרָה ; *Hi.*, *Gr.*, *Dy.*, *Bi.*, *Drv.*, *We.*, *Du.*, אֶחָרָה (*xix.* 3). Neither verb is a good parallel to אֹדֶדָה. *Lag. Ps. juxta Hebr. Hier.*, אֶקְרָה (1 *S.* *xviii.* 30)?? Surely we should read אֶזְמַר. ז and מ were transposed ; then ז became ו and מ-ק (*cp.* on *lxxiii.* 27*a*). שִׁמְךָ, which follows, represents זִמְרָה, a fragment of אֶזְמַר, written as a correction of אֶקְרָה. Omit נִגַּד (editorial insertion), and read חֲסִידֶךָ.



## PSALM LIII.

AN Elohist edition of Ps. xiv., placed after Ps. lii. on account of the reference to נָבֵל, 'the impious,' with this composite heading, 'Deposited. Of Salmath. Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.' Street suggested that the variations might be intentional, the psalm having been retouched to adapt it to some recent event. But the ordinary causes of corruption sufficiently account for the textual phenomena. That the last editor read נָבֵל, does not prove this to be right.

## PSALM LIV.

TRIMETERS. Exposed to the assaults of wicked men, foreigners, pious Israel appeals to its God. Duhm supposes an individual to be the speaker, but even if we adopt זָדִים, 'proud ones,' in v. 5, it will be too bold in an individual to appropriate phrases elsewhere, and much more fittingly, applied to the community. Cp. Smend, 116, who, however, underestimates the historical colouring of the psalm. The foes of the speaker being named in other psalms of this group, we need not hesitate to read ethnic names in v. 5 (see crit. note). As in the case of li., lii., lvi., lvii., lix., lx., we seem to get a clue to the origin of the very unpalatable title in the traditional text.

*Deposited. Of the Ishmaelites. Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan. 1, 2*  
[Concerning] the Zarephathites.

1	Succour me, O Yahwè ! by thy right hand,	3
	And right me by thy strength.	
	O Yahwè ! hearken to my prayer,	4
	Listen to the words of my mouth.	
	For those of Zarephath assail me,	5
	Misrites seek after my soul ;	
	[Thy judgments they do not fear,]	
	They have not set thee, O Yahwè ! before them.	
	Be a helper unto me, O Yahwè !	6
10	Redeem me from those that seek my soul.	
	Let the evil return on the Ishmaelites,	7
	For their wickedness do thou extirpate them.	
	With the lyre will I chant hymns unto thee,	8
	And give thanks in thy house to thy name, <sup>1</sup>	
	Because from all distress thou hast rescued me,	9
	Mine eye sees the fate of mine enemies.	

1. **By thy right hand.** Cp. cxxxviii. 7. 'By thy name,' i.e. 'by thy glory' (Isa. xxx. 27), is not natural here. Duhm's explanation ('by a manifestation of thy presence in the temple') is far-fetched. Not so in l. 14.

5. **Those of Zarephath.** This old name too was affected by the psalmists (cp. lxxxiii. 8, lxxxvii. 4, xciv. 20). The editor who expanded the heading probably found 'Sefathites' — a shorter form of Şarephathites, and

<sup>1</sup> Yahwè.

confounded it with 'Ziphites.' A league of tribes is supposed.—8. Note that Abraham does not expect to find 'the fear of God' in Gerar, according to Gen. xx. 11.

13 f. Imitated in Jon. ii. 10. Observe that Yahwè's 'name' is his *numen*, the divinity resident in the temple, and apprehended in the cultus.

*Critical Notes.* 1. M בְּשִׁמְךָ. Read בְּיָמֶיךָ (Gr.); note parallelism.

5 f. M זָרִים (Pasek follows), עֲרִיצִים. T and several MSS. (Kenn., de R.), besides the || passage, lxxxvi. 14, read זָרִים. Ol. (doubtfully), Gr., Smend, Duhm, Bertholet, prefer this. But if עֲרִיצִים is right, we expect זָרִים (Isa. xxv. 5, xxix. 5, Ezek. xxxi. 12). Consistency, however, requires the corrections מְצָרִים, צָרָפְתִּים. See introd.

7. Inserted by pure conjecture.—8. Read שְׁמוֹךְ (Gr.); as lxxxvi. 14.

9. M אֲדֹנִי בְּסִמְכִי נַפְשִׁי. But surely after II. 1—8 a fervent petition is indispensable. Add to this that M's text is untranslatable. Most take ב for the *Beth essentialis*, and סִמְכִי for a case of the intensive plural (Kön., § 338 β). But the plural is as unnatural here as in cxviii. 7a (see note); בְּסִמְכִי would be better (cp. Moore on Judg. xi. 35), but what of נַפְשִׁי? Read נִפְּלֵנִי מִמְּבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשִׁי. The corruptions and transpositions of letters are obvious.

11. The יָשׁוּב of Kt. and T is correct. Kr. יָשִׁיב, though all the vss. but T, many MSS. and several editions, also Hitz. and Del., prefer it, is an unnecessary conjecture.—M לְשִׁרְרִי. Read לִישְׁמְעָאֵל (cp. on v. 9, lix. 11b).

12. M בְּאַמְתָּךְ. But הַצִּמִּיתָ follows. 'In thy faithfulness deliver us,' would be more possible. The metre too is not satisfied. Read וּבְרַעְתָּם (xciv. 23); cp. on xxv. 5b. Ordinary transposition and corruption of letters (cp. next note).

13 f. M בְּנִרְבָּה. G (cp. T) ἐκουσίως; in Num. xv. 3 'בִּנְ' clearly means 'spontaneously.' But we should expect נִרְבָּה, 'freewill offerings,' with אֹזֶבַח. Even so there would be a want of parallel passages in the Psalter. Gr. reads אֹמְרָה, rightly, for אֹזֶבַח. But this is not enough. For 'בִּנְ', read בְּכִנּוּר. This is paraphrased in Jon. ii. 10 (where אֹזֶבַח should be אֹמְרָה) by כִּי־טוֹב—בְּקוֹל תּוֹדָה (cp. lii. 11) comes in rather awkwardly; contrast cxxxv. 3. Read בְּבִיתְךָ. טוֹב and בֵּית are elsewhere confounded. Omit יְהוָה (gloss).

15. M הִצִּילֵנִי. Are not we commentators too ready to accept such incongruities? Read הִצִּילָתִנִּי (G S, Gr.).

16. Read באִיבִי (without ו), for metre, with Grimme.

## PSALM LV.

PLAINLY this is a composite psalm. *Vv.* 20(end)–24 cannot be conveniently interwoven with the rest of the psalm. They are also in a different metre. Ps. lv.<sup>(1)</sup> consists of trimeters; Ps. lv.<sup>(2)</sup> of pentameters. Both, however, have the same theme—Israel's danger from the hostile neighbouring populations. We have already met with specimens enough of this kind of psalm. Except in Ps. xlv., however, we have not found references to such glaring outrages as are apparently mentioned in the true text of *v.* 5, which reminds us of Pss. lxxiv., lxxix., and the second of the Lamentations. The loud cries of the foreigners produced a deep impression on the Jews (cp. lxxiv. 4, Lam. ii. 6 f.); they were the accompaniment of the destruction of the temple and palaces of Jerusalem (cp. lxxix. 1b, xciv. 20). This is what the psalmist really, or in imagination, has just witnessed. No wonder that pious Israel (who is the true speaker, should fall into the deepest despondency, and seem to himself to be at the point of death. Gladly would he find refuge in the rocky homes of the wild doves (see on *v.* 8), for he fears these violent men, whose various nationalities, as usual, he enumerates. He prays that a speedy death may put an end to their mischief. He knows that the prayers of the congregation will be answered. The plans of the Jerahmeelites (here as elsewhere the heads of a league of peoples) will be frustrated.

To this is appended a description of the godlessness of the Jerahmeelites (cp. *v.* 10), which may be illustrated by the story of the murder of Gedaliah in Jer. xli. For the Ishmael, whose violation of the bond of guestship by a cold-blooded murder is there related, was no Jew, but, as we are distinctly told, of the race of Jerahmeel,<sup>1</sup> a mercenary soldier, employed at first by Zedekiah, but afterwards by the king of the Ammonites. And it is possible that, just as Ps. lv.<sup>(1)</sup>, like the kindred psalms (see on Ps. xlv.<sup>(2)</sup>), is probably based on the tradition in 2 K. xxiv. 2 (see corrected text), so Ps. lv.<sup>(2)</sup> may be a poetic commemoration of the murder of Gedaliah by this Jerahmeelite. That either poem is contemporary with the events referred to is not to be supposed. Whether it is history or imagination that the N. Arabians took part in the destruction of the buildings of Jerusalem (cp. Pss. lxxiv., lxxix.), we cannot tell for certain, but the persistence of the belief that they did so is in favour of an affirmative answer. To quote from the psalms is needless, but we may compare the psalms, as here given, with the post-exilic passages, Amos i. 11 f., Obad. 11. In the former passage the pitiless persecution of Israel by Edom is punished by the destruction by fire of the palaces of Bozrah, and the law of 'like for like' suggests that Edom had first of all destroyed, or joined in destroying, the palaces of Jerusalem. In the latter Edom is represented as having been as one of the foreigners who 'entered Jerusalem's gates, and cast lots upon it.' With this we should (see *Crit. Bib.*) compare Joel iv. (iii.) 3 ff., where Moab and Midian and all the districts of Sarefath are denounced for 'casting lots' for Yahwe's people and for carrying Yahwe's silver and gold into their temples or palaces. We have no reason to suppose that such warlike peoples and such enemies of Israel as the Edomites and N. Arabians would content themselves with 'looting' the Jewish capital, and we may probably assume that there was a N. Arabian as well as a Babylonian invasion (cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. xxiv., xxv.). It was the havoc wrought by these men of kindred race which affected the Jews of the post-exilic age more than any cruelties of the Babylonians, because it was recalled to their recollection by the bitter hostility still shown to them in word and deed by the 'sons of Esau.' The unwarlike spirit of the writers, however, forbids us to bring these psalms down as late as the Maccabean rising, in spite of the striking parallel in 1 Macc. v. 1–4. The parallelism is, in fact, when we look into it, very incomplete.

Thus the historical situation of the psalm (as well as the other members of the group, liv.–lix.) is transformed. There is a large amount of poetic imagination in it, but the passion, at any rate, is not simulated; the psalmists are thinking of

<sup>1</sup> In Jer. xli. 1 both מלוכה and רבי המלך are corruptions of 'Jerahmeel.' Cp. 'Jerahmeel,' *Enc. Bib.*, also *Crit. Bib.* on Jer. l.c.

the present quite as much as of the past. Earlier theories need not here be criticized. The speaker in Ps. lv. is not the pious high priest, Onias III., who being filled with horror at the wickedness of Jerusalem, and knowing that there are designs on his life, meditates flight (so virtually Theod. Mops., see Bâ. in *ZATW*, v. 88, vi. 276 ff.). Nor is he the prophet Jeremiah—a view much older than Hitzig (see *OP*, 122)—whose character was not so soft—not to say weak—as this theory implies. See ‘Jeremiah,’ *Enc. Bib.*, where the real Jeremiah and the real prophecies of Jeremiah are indicated, and notice that all important phraseological points of contact with the Book of Jeremiah disappear in a corrected text (cp. on *vv.* 7–9). Whether even the editor, in rewriting *vv.* 13–15, thought of Jeremiah’s priestly opponent Pashhur (Pedahzur), may well be doubted.

*Deposited: of the Ishmaelites. Deposited: of ‘Arab-*

•  
LV.—I.  
•

- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 1  | Hearken to my prayer, O Yahwè !                     | 2  |
|    | And hide not thyself from mine entreaty ;           |    |
|    | Attend unto me and answer me.                       | 3  |
|    | My body trembles, and I am astonished—              |    |
|    | At the mockery of [the Jerahmeelites and] Arabians, | 4  |
|    | At the cries of the sons of Asshur.                 |    |
|    | For my palaces they have swallowed up,              |    |
|    | My habitations they have destroyed.                 |    |
|    | My heart is anguished within me,                    | 5  |
| 10 | Terror has fallen upon me ;                         |    |
|    | Fear and trembling enter into me,                   | 6  |
|    | And gloom of Deathland+ envelopes me.               |    |
|    | And I think, ‘ Oh, that I had wings !               | 7  |
|    | Dove-like would I flee away and find rest ;         |    |
|    | Yea, I would fly afar off,                          | 8  |
|    | And lodge in the desert of rocks.’                  |    |
|    | I will take refuge in God mine asylum               | 9  |
|    | Because of Jerahmeel and Mişsur.                    |    |
|    | Those of Edom have annihilated my sanctuaries,      | 10 |
| 20 | The Arabians have destroyed my palaces.             |    |
|    | Jerahmeelites and Asshurites,                       | 11 |
|    | Ammon and Amalek lay waste ;                        |    |
|    | Rehoboth and Ishmael lay waste,                     | 12 |
|    | Moab and the house of the Hagrites.                 |    |
|    | For the Arabian insults me and the Ishmaelite,      | 13 |
|    | They that hate me jeer at me ;                      |    |

- Thou too art in the cabal of my haters, 14  
 O thou mine associate and acquaintance ;  
 Together we took sweet counsel, 15  
 30 And praised in the house of God.  
 Let Death overmaster them in a moment, 16  
 Let them go down alive into Sheol,  
 The Jerahmeelites and the Şarefathites,  
 The Rehobothites and the Hagrites !  
 As for me I call upon Yahwè ; 17  
 He will deliver me from the Arabians.  
 In the assembly of the pious I make my plaint, 18  
 I moan, he will hear my voice ;  
 He will set me free from Ishmael, 19  
 40 From the league of those of Jerahmeel ;  
 The Ishmaelites he will humble, 20  
 The Jerahmeelites he will put to shame.

## L.V.—2.

- 1 Void of piety is the house of Jerahmeel ; | they fear  
 not God. 20b  
 He has laid hands on one at peace with him, | desecrated  
 his covenant. 21  
 Smoother than butter is his face, | but his heart is a  
 grave ; 22  
 Softer than oil are his words, | but sharper than javelins.  
 Corrupt are the deeds which he practises, | and yet he  
 prospers, 23  
 Never does he see [evil], | his ancles waver not ;  
 But thou, O Yahwè ! wilt bring them down | in a  
 moment to the pit, 24  
 [To] the Ishmaelites<sup>1</sup> their days will be short, | but I  
 myself trust in thee.

4. **I was astonished**, *i.e.* at Yahwè's apparent desertion of his people. Cp. lxxiii. 21, lxxvii. 4.—5 f. Cp. // 21-25, 32-34, 39-42, xlv. 17, lxxiv. 4 f.—7 f. Cp. especially lxxiv. 9a, lxxix. 16, Lam. ii. 5, 7, Isa. lxiv. 11 [10].—12. Note the parallelism of xlv. 20.

13-16. **Oh that I had wings!** Cp. cxxxix. 10a, where the poet imagines himself flying on the wings of the sun ; xi. 16 is only parallel in M. The supposed parallel in Jer. ix. 1 [2] is not worth much. There the prophet wishes he could leave his own people and lodge

<sup>1</sup> Edomites, Jerahmeelites.

in the wilderness. Here, however, it is the people itself which speaks, and its longing is to be able to fly not into any ordinary wilderness, but to the rocks, where the wild doves have their home (cp. Cant. ii. 14, Jer. xlviii. 28, Ezek. vii. 16)—say those near En-gedi, where Robinson the traveller (*BR* ii. 245) found multitudes of pigeons enjoying their nests undisturbed. The speaker in the psalm was not a wild dove, but a tame one. On the symbolic use of the dove for Israel, see note on lxxviii. 14.

17, 18. **I will take refuge.** A resolution, not a contingency.—*Alme asylum*; cp. xviii. 2.

21—24. The usual list of enemies (see on lxxxiii. 7—9). The combination of Jerahmeel and Amalek (which originally meant the same people) shows how conventional the list is.

27 ff. The hostility of the former

'acquaintances' of Israel is repeatedly referred to; disloyal Israelites are meant. The description in M is due to the editor, who based his pathetic picture on the fragments of a hardly legible text (see crit. note). Apparently the seductions of so-called progress were not slight among the post-exilic Israelites.

31. **Death.** Sheol (= Death, see on vi. 6) is here personified as a creditor or taskmaster.

37. The reference to the hours of daily prayer is as inappropriate in this moment of excitement as in v. 6 (see crit. note there). Cp. *E. Rib.*, 'Prayer,' § 3.

lv.<sup>(2)</sup> 1. See introd. Schultens and Ewald tried to get the requisite sense out of חליפות, but too violently. See crit. note.—3 f. Cp. v. 10.—6. Cp. x. 6.—8. Cp. Prov. x. 27.

**Critical Notes.** 4. אָרִיד בְּשִׁיחִי וְאֶהֱיָה, is very suspicious. (a) As to אָרִיד. Σ J (καταχέχθην, *humiliatus sum*) imply אָרַד; cp. יָרַד in Isa. xv. 3. Now יָרַד in Isa. l.c. is corrupt; indeed, the supposed רֹד cannot be shown to exist. From Isa. xxii. 4 some (Gr., Che. [*SBOT*, 'Isaiah,' Heb. 119], Du.) have been led to suggest אָמַר or אָמַר. But we should expect בָּבְכִי to follow (Isa. xv. 3). (b) As to אֶהֱיָה. This is defended by Kōn. (i. 464) and Nöld. (*ZDMG*, xxxvii. 540), but from a text-critical point of view it is very improbable. Grätz would read either אֶהְיָה (v. 17) or וְאֶהֱיָה (lxxvii. 4). Lag. prefers the former, Ol. and Bā. the latter alternative. Duhm, however, prefers אֶהְיָה; in fact, the ἐπαράχθη of G seems to presuppose this; cp. Σ Dt. vii. 23. There is so much corruption, however, in v. 3 that we may justly feel uneasy. Critics should have taken our passage in connexion with lxxiii. 21 (יִתְחַמֵּן) and especially lxxvii. 4; see notes on those passages. They would then have seen that the most probable reading is וְאֶתְמָה. Returning now to (a), we see that the root מָרַר is not the most suitable one. Herz has acutely suggested אָחַרַר instead of אָרִיד, but does not go further. Comparing cxix. 120, should we not emend בְּשִׁיחִי into בְּשָׂרִי, and read, as L. 4, יִחַרַד בְּשָׂרִי וְאֶתְמָה? The reading אֶהֱיָה perhaps arose under the influence of יִרְחַמְאֵלִי in L. 5; i.e. 'יר was written before, instead of after מָקַלְס (see next note), and the two words אֶתְמָה and 'יר became fused.

5 f. Read מָקַלְס [יִרְחַמְאֵלִי] וְעָרְבִי | מִצַּעֲקָת בְּנֵי אֲשׁוּר; cp. xlv. 17. On the omitted 'יר see preceding note. M's כְּקוֹל is too weak as a

parallel to עקת or (as Ol. acutely corrects) צעקת. G. Hoffmann (*ZATW*, iii. 100) defends עקת as meaning 'clamour,' though a root עוק, 'to cry out,' only exists in Arabic. The vss. make עיק = ציק. Herz reads עקשות רשע. is not uncommonly a substitute for אשור.

7 f. M's ימיטו (cp. cxi. 11, Kt.) is troublesome. G *ἐξέκλιναν* = נטו (cp. xxi. 12, M G). Σ *ἐπέριψαν*; J *proiecerunt*. The true reading underlies ימיטו and און. The || noun is concealed under ישטמוני באף, corrupt, as in lvi. 8. Analogy favours reading thus:—

כי ארמנותי בלעו | ומשפנותי אבדו

10. M *אימות מות*. Read simply *אימה מות* (G *θανάτου*) is an expansion of מת (dittographed). The plurals אימים and אימות occur only in corrupt passages.

12. M *פלצות*. G S presuppose *צלמות*, which is no doubt right (so Gr.). The same corruption in Ezek. vii. 18.

16. M G *אלו במדבר סלה*. *אלו* is metrically insufficient. Something would be gained by reading *ואתלונן* (xci. 1). Unfortunately, *במדבר* is also doubtful. 'Doves do not fly into the wilderness' (Duhm), at least unless there are rocks in the wilderness (see exeg. note). Duhm omits *כיונה* as a gloss. Surely we should read *סלעים במדבר סלעים* (see exeg. note). This involves taking *סלה* into our critical material, but this we have again and again already had occasion to do. *סלה* may represent *סלם* (an imperfectly written *סלעים*), cp. *אביה* and *אבים*, *נכרים* and *נכרים*.

17. M *אחשה*, intransitively and without *אל*. G (followed in ed. 1) has *προσεδεχόμενῃ τὸν θεὸν* (so א<sup>ab</sup>. T) *τὸν σώζοντά με*, = *אחשה לי*, i.e. 'I would wait in silence for the God,' &c. But comparing xviii., l. 2 (corr. text), it is better to read *מפלט*, and *אחשה* should clearly be *אחסה*. Read probably *מפלטי*. *לי* in M may be a distortion of *אל*. Herz suggests *לי חשה מפלטי*, which strikes me as too mechanical a correction; Gr., inadequately, *אבקשה*.

18. M *מרוח סעה מפער*. But the dove wishes to leave something behind it. The idea of l. 18 is altogether wrong; it is useless to correct *סעה* into *סופה* (Hu., Gr., Bi.). And why the double phrase? Parallel passages suggest *מירחמאל ומאשור*; cp. M 5 f.

19 f. The petition, 'Confound their speech' (cp. Gen. xi. 7) is not natural here. And what of *בלע*? Is it a synonym of *פלג* 'to cleave' (so Schultens)? And if *בלע* here = *בלל* (cp. Barth, *Beitr. zur Erklärung des Jes.*, p. 4), what becomes of *פלג*? In l. 20 *ראיתי* is plainly a

bad editorial conjecture, while חמס is impossible as a parallel to ריב. And what a descent v. 10b is after v. 10a! Comparing lxxiv. 9 (corr. text), Lam. ii. 6 f., read—

בְּלָעוּ אֲדָמִים מִקֶּדְשִׁי  
אֲרָמוֹתַי שַׁחַתוּ עֲרָבִים

ערבים are, of course, duplicates of ריב and בעיר; תש=מס.

21-24 were grievously misunderstood by the editor. Analogous corruptions elsewhere enable us to read underneath—

יִרְחַמְאֵלִים וְאֲשׁוּרִים  
עֲמוֹן וְעַמְלֵק הִחָרִיבוּ  
רַחֲבוֹת וַיִּשְׁמְעֵאל הִחָרִיבוּ  
מוֹאָב וּבֵית הַנָּגִידִים

The extreme ingenuity of the editor—working with a preconceived idea of the meaning—will be admitted. Beginners who have followed me hitherto will see how in each case he came to err. על-חומתיה is a transformation of a duplicate of ירחמאל. און is either און or עמון.

25-27. 'For it was not an enemy that insulted me.' But this contradicts v. 4. Nor is the sense clear. Does the speaker really mean that the insults of enemies were tolerable, or that he could have hidden himself more easily if his mocker had not formerly been his friend? The Pasek after כי, and the frequency with which אויב has displaced ערבי should put us on our guard. In reality, vv. 13-15 are not a digression containing a rather sentimental description of a friend's ingratitude, but a continuation of what precedes. Read (omitting the first לא and ממונו as inserted by the editor, on a false hypothesis, to make sense)—

כִּי עֲרָבִי יִחַרְפְּנִי וַיִּשְׁמְעֵאֵלִי  
מִשְׁנֵאֵי עָלִי הִלְעִיג  
וְאֶתָּה בִּקְשָׁר שׁוֹנֵאֵי

Thus the two linguistic puzzles הנדיל עלי (cp. on xli. 10), and כערכי disappear. — 28. Read perhaps מודעי (Gr.); cp. Isa. xii. 5 Kr.; Ruth xi. 1 Kr.

30. M נהלה (with ב). Read נהלל. ל became כ, cp. on lxviii. 22b.

31. M בִּרְנֶשׁ, a non-existent word (cp. on ii. 1, lxiv. 3). Read בִּרְנֶע, and connect it with v. 16 (Lag.). Cp. lv.<sup>(2)</sup>, l. 7. — M ישימות (Kt.), or ישימות (Kr.; also given as Kt.); Pasek follows. So Ginsb.; Baer ישיא. Both readings are highly questionable. ישיא in lxxxix. 23 is corrupt;



יְשִׁמוֹת is only known by Beth-jeshimoth (?). Read יְנִשֵּׁם מָוֶת (cp. on lxxxix. 23). Herz, however, יִסַּע מָוֶת לָמוּ, or יִשְׂאֵם מָוֶת עוֹלָם. Wellh. remarks, 'Kethib is at least right so far as this—that it regards יִש as a single word.' Why?

33. M's מ'עֲלִינוּ is a corruption of יִרְחַמְאֵלִים, which, however, should of course come after הָיִים. The speaker pleases himself by repeating the names of the doomed peoples. The next name is probably וְצִרְפָּתִים, which underlies כִּי־רֵעוֹת (כ for פ; cp. פִּידוֹ for כִּידוֹ, Job xxi. 20).

34. M בְּמִגְוִירָם בִּקְרָבָם. בְּמִ is very odd; G ἐν ταῖς παροικίαις αὐτῶν, as if יִהְיֶה; cp. Job xviii. 19. Most explain as if בְּמִגְוִירָתָם 'in their storehouse,' and render בִּקְרָבָם 'in their heart'—a forced climax. Considering the likeness of בְּמִגְוִירָם to מִרְחָבָה in 7. 12, we should probably read יִרְחַבְתִּים; בִּקְרָ should be וְהִנָּרִים (lxxxiii. 7).

36. M עֲרַב. Read מְעַרְבִים or מְעַרְבֵי. See exeg. note.

37 f. M וְצִהְרִים וְבִקְרָ. Read בְּקֶהֱל חֲסִידִים (cxlix. 1). — Point וְיִשְׁמְעֵי.

39. M בְּשָׁלוֹם. Read יִפְדֶּה מִיִּשְׁמַעְיָאֵל. י was absorbed (see 7. 38).

40. Read מִחֲבֵר יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. What follows מִקְרָב (מִחֲבֵר) consists of two corruptions of יִרְחַמְאֵלִים.

41 f. Note the three Paseks, and read יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵלִים יַעֲנֶה | וְיִרְחַמְאֵלִים יִבִּישׁ. To suppose a *Beth essentie* in בְּרָבִים is most far-fetched. Gr., פֶּרְבִים יִשָּׁב קָדֶם is too bold a phrase; G paraphrases; Σ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

lv.<sup>(2)</sup> 1. M אֲשֶׁר אֵין חֲלִיפוֹת לָמוּ. Critics have been in sad want of a clue. Read אֵין־חֶסֶד לְבֵית יִרְחַמְאֵל. Such condensations do occur. חֲלִיפוֹת might indeed come from חֲמֻלָּה = חֲמָלָה, cp. Job xiv. 14 (end), where read חֲמֻלָּתָהּ. Gr. suggested חֲמֻלוֹת. But לָמוּ and אֲשֶׁר have to be adequately accounted for. חֲלִי does double duty; it represents primarily יִרַח, but ל also stands for the preposition in לְבֵית.

2. M בְּשָׁלְמוֹ. An adj. שָׁלוֹם, however, is non-existent (cp. Ges.-Bu. and Cornill on Jer. xiii. 19. We have to read either בְּשָׁלְמוֹ = בְּשִׁלְמוֹ (see Bā. on vii. 5) or, better, בְּאִישׁ־שָׁלְמוֹ (xli. 10). Cp. on lxix. 23.

3. Read חֲלָקוֹ מִחֲמָאָה פָּנָיו. So Bā.; cp. Gr., Ol., We. Note Pasek in M; the points ignore the old ending ת־. G implies פָּנָיו; cp. Prov. xv. 14, Kx.—M וְקָרָב־. Read וְקָרַב (cp. 7. 10). The passages with קָרַב need testing; cp. on lxxviii. 31, lxxviii. 9.

4. M **וְהִמָּה פְתָחוֹת**. Read **וְיָחִידוּ מִתְרַתְּחִים**. **תִּרְתַּח** is a loan-word (cp. Ass. *tartaḥu*, 'javelin' [Del.] or 'lance' [Jensen]) which also occurs under a disguise in Micah v. 5, Job xxxviii. 36, xli. 21, and perhaps in Jer. ii. 34 (for M's **מַחְתֶּרֶת**). Cp. *JQR*, July, 1898, and *Crit. Bib.* G **βολίδες**; 'A **λόγχοι**; E' in Mic. *παράξιφουσιν*. But cp. Kön. § 305e.

5 f. 'Between 22b and 24a,' says Duhm, 'a marginal quotation has intruded. It is a general statement like xxxvii. 5, which does not, however, quite suit the case of the poet, since he does not elsewhere fear for his life; least of all has he anxiety about food.' Of course, if the text is correct; but ought not **יִהְיֶה** to awaken suspicion (see Kön. ii. 141, note)? And have not many supposed glosses turned out to be simply misread passages of the text? One can hardly doubt that **לְצַדִּיק** after **מוֹט** is a corruption of **קִרְסָלָיו** (see on xviii. 37b). Probably x. 6 is parallel, and we may read somewhat as follows (note Pasek in M):—

**הַשְׁחִית עֲלֵילוֹת דְּרָכָיו | וְהוּא יִשְׁכָּל  
לֹא-יָבִישׁ [רַע] לְעוֹלָם | [לֹא] פִּטְיוֹ קִרְסָלָיו**

7. M **אלהים**. Read **יהוה**.—M **לְבָאֵר שַׁחַת**. More plausibly **לְבוֹר שַׁחַת**. But the phrase is tautological. Read probably **בְּרִנֵּעַ לְשַׁחַת**.

8. M **לֹא**. Ethnic names disguised, as so often. Read **יִשְׁמַעֲאֵלִים אֲדָמִים וִירַחְמָאֵלִים**. The two latter names are glosses. To 'שמ' prefix **ל**, and retain in the text. M **יִחַצּוּ**, 'divide'?? Read probably **יִקְצְרוּ** (Prov. x. 27). Thus we get for a—**לִישְׁמ' יִקְצְרוּ יִמְיָהוּ**.

## PSALM LVI.

**TRIMETERS.** The psalm is like a continuation of Ps. lv.; for phraseology and ideas cp. also liv., lvii., lix.

*Deposited. Of the Ishmaelites. Of the Korahites. Of 'Arab-ethan.*  
*A supplication. On beholding the Zarephathites (?).* 1

1 Pity me, O Yahwè ! the Ishmaelites crush me, 2  
Those of Jerahmeel press me hard. <sup>1</sup>  
They are in excitement, they array themselves against me, 6  
All their devices aim at evil.

<sup>1</sup> Words are here repeated from // 13-18.

Behold, the Arabians watch me, 7  
 The Asshurites lie in wait for me ;  
 Zarephath [and] Jerahmeel join together ; 8  
 Cast down the Arabians, O Yahwè !

My sighs, O Yahwè ! thou hast counted, 9  
 10 Thou hast laid up my tears in thy store-chamber.  
 The Arabians will be put to flight, 10  
 The Jerahmeelites [will stumble].

I am sure that Yahwè is for me ;  
 Continually do I boast of his promise. 11  
 In Yahwè I am fearlessly confident, 12  
 What +indeed+ can earth's race do to me ?

I will praise thee, O Yahwè ; with the lyre, 13  
 I will give thee the due thank-offerings ;  
 For thou hast rescued me from Deathland,  
 That I may walk +in safety+ before Yahwè.

Title. See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Psalms,'  
 § 26, 11 ; 'Jonath-elem-rechokim.' Cp.  
 also the corrupt ים רחקים, lvi. 6.

7. **Join together.** Cp. lxxxiii.  
 9a.—8. בָּאָה, corrupt, as in lv. 4.—  
*Cast down*, i.e. into the abyss (lv. 24).  
 —9. It is a fine idea—that of God's  
 counting the sighs which, though many  
 (Lam. i. 22), are 'not hid' from Him  
 (xxxviii. 10), and which He carefully  
 notices (xii. 6, 2 K. xx. 5). Cp. Matt.  
 x. 30, and George Herbert's line, 'I

have not lost one single tear.' But the  
 figure supposed in M's reading ('into  
 thy bottle') is grotesque. See crit.  
 note.

12. **Will stumble.** Cp. lv. 24,  
 end (corr. text).—14. *His promise*, i.e.  
 the great Messianic prophecy of Israel's  
 deliverance and glorification ; cp. cxix.  
 74, cxxx. 5.—16. Cp. cxviii. 6.—17.  
 Cp. liv. 8 (corr. text).—19 f. Cp. cxvi.  
 8 f., where the suggestions of our psalm  
 are expanded.

*Crit. Notes.* Title. Nowhere does tradition more urgently need  
 revision. Analogy requires ethnic names here as elsewhere. על־יְיָ  
 should most probably be על־נְיָנָה, and בְּנֵה (end) should be בְּנֵינָה  
 (cp. liv., lv.). אֵלֶם רַחֲקִים comes from עַל־הַרְחָקִים. As soon as the  
 corrupt לְדֹר had arisen, it became natural to interpret the other  
 parts of the corrupt title so as to suggest an episode in the life of David.  
 On Neginoth see *Introd.*

1. אֱלֹהִים. Read יָהּ, which was joined in pronunciation to חֲנָנִי.  
 'Non שָׁאָה and שָׁה poeta voluerat' (Lag.). So lvii. 4. Now., Bā., and  
 Ges.-Bu. agree. Cp. the proper names חִילָאִם and טִילָאִם, and שֹׁאִפִּים  
 in Am. ii. 7. Cp. Bleek-Wellh., *Einl.*<sup>(4)</sup>, p. 636.—M's reading אֲנִי, and  
 even Herz's שׁוֹנֵא, are surely too vague. שֹׁנֵא (an earlier reading) is  
 a variant to שׁוֹרְרִי (now found in v. 2) ; for which cp. v. 9 (crit. note),  
 xxvii. 11, liv. 7, lix. 11 (note). Read יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים (cp. on xc. 3).—2. M

פְּלִדְהִיּוֹם לַחֵם. A false reading made up of fragments of יִרְחֲמָאֵלִי (two beats). Cp. on xxv. 5, xliv. 23, lxxiv. 22, etc. *V.* 3 in *M* is made up of variants of words in *v.* 2. *V.* 2*a* becomes שֹׁאֲפֹ שׁוֹרְרִי; the rest is an accumulation of corrupt fragments of יִרְחֲמָאֵלִים. Cp. כִּי־רָבִים with כִּי־רָבִים in lv. 19. Duhm rightly sees that *vv.* 4, 5 = *vv.* 11, 12. On *v.* 13 he is less satisfactory. Surely the analysis of מָרוֹם into מֵר יוֹם is too mechanical. Herz suggests אִם יִרְנִי; cp. G *φωβηθήσονται*. Line 3. *M* יִרְנִי. Read [יִתְעַצֵּב] יִתְעַצֵּב עָלַי (cp. lix. 4). 'ר' יִת' correspond to יִנּוּרִי יִצְפִּינוּ (misplaced, with *Pasek*, in *v.* 7); יִצְפִּינוּ comes from יִתְעַצֵּב; G's ἐβδελύσσονται represents יִתְעַצֵּב, another corruption of יִתְעַצֵּב. כִּלְהִירֵם דְּבָרִי in *v.* 6 corresponds to [בְּ] בָּאֱלֹהִים דְּבָרִי in *v.* 11; see on *L.* 14.--5. *M* הִמָּה. Read הִנֵּה; cp. עֲמָקִים for עֲנָקִים, Jer. xlvii. 5 (?). Continue, עֲרָבִים יִשְׁמְרוּנִי.—6. *M* בְּאֶשֶׁר קָוִי נִפְשִׁי. Impossible. Read אֲשׁוּרִים אָרְבוּ לְנַפְשִׁי. כ represents נִי in *L.* 5.

7 f. *M* עֲלֵ־אֶן פִּלְט־לָמוּ. For פִּלַּט *Ol.*, *Ew.*, *We.*, etc., read פָּלַס 'weigh (retribution to them)'; עֲלֵ־אֶן פִּלַּס would be better (see on lviii. 3). But the corruption lies deeper. Here and in *L.* 8 we need ethnics. יִלּוֹן [יִרְחֲ] מֵאֵל = לָמוּ; see 'Palti,' *E. Bib.* צִרְפַּת = פִּלַּס [ש] = פִּלַּס. Read עֲרָבִים = בָּאֵר. —*M* צִרְפַּת וִירְחֲמָאֵל. —*M* עֲרָבִים (with *Pasek*). Read עֲרָבִים.

9. *M* נִדִּי נֹד nowhere else; נֹד, Gen. iv. 16. We need a parallel to דְּמַעְתִּי. Read אֲנַחְתִּי (*Lam.* i. 22). *G* has τῆν ζῶσιν μου (*ἐξήγγειλά σοι*), or should we read ζῶσιν? Either הִיָּתִי or אֲבִנְתִּי might be a corruption of אֲנַחְתִּי. The same remark applies to *S* J, if τὰ ἐνδόν μου and *secretiora mea* represent מַחֲוִתִּי; cp. *G* li. 8 τὰ ἄδηλα for מַחֲוִת. Insert יהוה = הֵלָא (אֱלֹהִים) at end of verse.

10. *M* אֶתָּה שִׁימָה. Either read שִׁמְתָּה, and omit אֶתָּה, or read אֶסְמָת (cp. אֶסַם), *M* giving the word in two incomplete forms. *G* εἶθου.—Point דְּמַעְתִּי (*lxxx.* 6, *Lam.* ii. 11).—*M* בְּנֶאֱרָדָה. Read בְּמִגְוֹרָתָהּ. (*Hag.* ii. 19). The two following words should run אֱלֹהִים בְּמִגְוֹרָתָהּ. סִפְרָה is a dittogram or correction; on 'אל' see last note, end. (*Sirach* xliv. 4, but not *Ps.* lxxi. 15) must be wrong. *G* S *S* J, however, לִנְגִידָה; in *S* the second ἐνδόν σου should be ἐνώπιόν σου.

11 f. *M* אָן (with *Pasek*) and אוֹיְבִי both come from עֲרָבִים.—*M* בְּיוֹם אֶקְרָא, out of place here. The very first word of *L.* 1 is a cry. The line is also incomplete. Read יִרְחֲמָאֵלִים יִפְשְׁלוּ (cp. lv. 24, corr. text).

14. *M* בָּאֱלֹהִים. Read כִּלְהִירֵם. The error was produced by the vicinity of בָּאֱלֹהִים, which looks somewhat similar. See *v.* 5 in *G*, ἐν τῷ

θεῶ ἐπαυέσω τοὺς λόγους μου, where ὁλγν τῇν ἡμ. occurs to be a variant to ἐν τῷ θεῷ. Cp. crit. n. on xlv. 9.

17. עָלִי and still more נִדְרִי are peculiar. It is not enough to read נִדְרִי (S, Gr.). Read certainly יהוה בְּכִנּוּר אֶהְלֶלְךָ.

19 f. Omit הלא, *i.e.* אלהים, as a superfluous insertion; also רגלי מדחי and באור החיים(?) as late interpolations from cxvi. 8 f.

### PSALM LVII.—I.

**T**RIMETERS. Pious Jews have to live among unbelieving and hostile Arabians and Jerahmeelites (cp. xlii.—xliii., cxx.), but the plots of their enemies will be frustrated. The insertion of a passage from lvii.<sup>(2)</sup> as v. 6—as if a refrain—breaks the connexion. Cp. Duhm.

*Deposited. Of Ethan the Ezrahite. Of 'Arab-ethan. A supplication.*  
*When the sons of Ishmael and the Arabians drew near (?).* I

- |    |  |        |
|----|--|--------|
| I  | Pity me, O Yahwè! pity me,<br>For the Jerahmeelite crushes me,<br>And through the presence of the unholy I tremble,<br>Through those of Arabia and Rehoboth. | 2      |
|    | I call upon Yahwè the Most High,<br>Upon God who shows kindness to me;<br>Yahwè will reach forth from heaven,<br>He will rescue me from Deathland.           | 3<br>4 |
| 10 | I dwell in the midst of Arabians,<br>Beside the sons of Jerahmeel,<br>Whose teeth are spears and arrows,<br>And their tongue a sharp sword. <sup>1</sup>     | 5      |
|    | The Ishmaelites prepared a net,<br>They longed to catch my soul;<br>They digged before me a pit,<br>Into it the impious ones have fallen.                    | 7      |

2-4. Cp. lvi. 2; xlii. 10b; cx. 7 cp. vii. 18, lxxviii. 56—7 f. Cp. xviii. (corr. text, 'Rehoboth'). Cp. 'Rehoboth,' *Enc. Bib.*—5. 'Yahwè Elyon,' 17; lvi. 14.—9. Cp. cxx. 4-6; lviii. 7.

<sup>1</sup> V. 12 wrongly inserted as a refrain (v. 6).

*Critical Notes.* Title. See introd. The close originally ran בְּקִרְוֹב בְּנֵי־שִׁמְעוֹן וְעַרְבִים (cp. l. 13). To suit the life of David this had to be transformed. Some such solution as this seems necessary.

2 f. M **כִּי בֶךְ חֲסִידָה נִפְשִׁי**. But (1) we expect after **חֲנֻנִי** a description of the sad condition of the speaker, and (2) for the so-called 'archaic' form **חֲסִידָה** (Ol., *Lehrb.* 480) there is no complete parallel. Ivi. 2 supplies the clue. Read **וּבְצִל־פִּנְפִּיךָ אֲחֻסָּה**.—M **כִּי־יִרְחַמְאֵל שְׁפָנִי**.—**אֲחֻסָּה** after **חֲסִידָה**! Read **וּמִלֶּחֶץ חֲנָפִים אַחֲרָי** (cp. on xlii. 106).

4. M עֲדֵי־עֶבֶר הוּת. Bi., Du. עֲדֵי־עֶבֶרְנָה. But the phrase is at once so vague and so peculiar, and metre is so definitely violated that we ought to investigate the reading. הוּת has already proved doubtful in lv. 12 (cp. also lii. 9). Read מַעֲרָבִי וְרַחְבּוּתִי.—6. M גָּמַר. Read גָּמַל (Luzzatto, Gr., Bi., Che.<sup>11</sup>, Perles, Du.; cp. G).—7. Insert אֱלֹהִים after יִשְׁלַח, represented by סֵלָה (corrupt) and אֱלֹהִים in the same verse (4). Omit יוֹשִׁיעֹנִי, a corrupt variant to מִשְׁמִים.

8. M חסדו ואמתו נפשי. Both readings represent the complete metrical line יחֲלִיץ נַפְשִׁי מִמוֹת. Possibly (but see above) סֵלָה = שֹׁאֵל (= מוֹת). Note Paseḥ after נפשי (v. 5, misplaced). Cp. G, καὶ ἐρρύσατο τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἐκ μέσου σκύμνων. Previous emendations are most disappointing.

9. Read **בְּתוֹךְ עֲרָבִים שְׁכֵנִיתִי**. M's **אִשְׁכְּבָה** probably comes from **שְׁכֵנָה** (constructed with **נִפְשִׁי**, as cxx. 6), and this from **שָׁכַנָה**.—  
10. **יִם** in **לֵהִימִם** probably represents **עִם** (cxx. 5 f.). **לֵהִם** and **בְּנֵי־אָדָם** make up **בְּנֵי־יִרְחָמָאֵל**; **הֵם** comes from **חֵמוֹ**.—13. M **לִפְעָמִי**. Read **לְחַטֹּף נַפְשִׁי כְּסָפוֹ** (x. 9, xviῦ. 12).—15. M **בְּתוֹכָהּ סֵלָה**. Read **בְּתוֹכָהּ נְבִילִים**.

PSALM LVII.—2.

**TRIMETERS.** This little hymn of praise occurs again as cviii. 2-6; v. 11 is taken almost verbatim from xxxvi. 6. 'A new song' (l. 4) as in xxxiii. 3 (see note), xl. 4, and four times afterwards. Observe that v. 9c disappears, and with it the reason for calling this a morning-psalm.

I      My heart is ready, O Yahwè !      8  
          Unto thee will I sing and make melody.  
          Awake, my harp and my lyre !      9  
          I will sing a new song.

I will thank thee, O Yahwè ! among the peoples, 10  
 I will make melody unto thee among the nations.  
 For thy lovingkindness reaches the heavens, 11  
 Thy faithfulness the skies.  
 Exalt thyself, O Yahwè ! above the heavens ; 12  
 10 +Be+ thy glory above all the earth.

*Critical Notes.*—1. Omit the second לִבִּי נִכְנֹן, as in cviii. 2 (M, but not G), and substitute לֵךְ. This לֵךְ was misread לִבִּי; hence the repeated phrase.—3. Read בְּנֹרִי (xxx. 13).

3 f. Omit עוֹרָה כְּבוֹדִי (cviii. 2 'אֶפְדִּכַּ'); a scribe in error made the lyre precede the harp, and left the wrong words undeleted. But כְּבוֹדִי enables us to restore בְּנֹרִי; הַנֶּבֶל should be נֶבֶל; ה is due to dit-tography.—אֶעֱרֹה שִׁיחַר reminds us of Milton's 'cheerly rouse the slumbering morn,' but, however beautiful, is a misreading. First, it is against the parallelism; the dawn cannot be parallel to harp and lyre. Next, the two words 'א' ש' are not enough to make a line. G's ἐξέγερ-θῆσθαι ὁρᾶν, אֶעֱרֹה שִׁיחַר, is a poor conjecture. The right reading must be אֶשְׁרִיחַ שִׁיר חֲדָשׁ. [Duhm is content with correcting in v. 9a into

## PSALM LVIII.

**T**ETRAMETERS. The psalm has been greatly misunderstood owing to the errors of the text (see on Ps. lxxxii.). It is simply a description of the unworthy character of the judges, who belong to a wicked race—doomed to destruction when the day of judgment comes. The tone is bitter, but less bitter than M represents, and even the later insertion in *trimeters* (with which compare the inserted passage, Isa. lix. 5-8) is comparatively temperate. Compare, besides Ps. lxxxii., the strong, yet not exactly intemperate, language of Pss. x., xiv., xciv., and note the parallelism between L. 14 and Ps. xlix. 12 (corr. text). The mention of the Edomites in L. 2 does not exclude the possibility that renegade Jews may also have been represented among the wicked judges. On title (v. 1) see introd.

*Deposited. Of Ethan the Ezrahite. Of 'Arab-ethan.*

*A supplication.*

1 Do ye, O impious ones ! give just sentences ? 2  
 Do ye judge uprightly, O ye sons of Edom ?  
 Only deeds that bring ruin do ye perform in the land, 3  
 By false witnesses ye overthrow the righteous.

- The wicked become apostates from the birth, 4  
 From their first breath they err, they speak lies.  
 A poison is theirs, like a serpent's venom, 5  
 10 Yea, like +that of+ a deaf adder, which stops its ears,  
 Which hears not the voice of charmers, 6  
 The spells of a skilful magician \* \* .
- O Yahwè ! subvert the dwellings of the insulters ! 7  
 Beat down the castles of the deniers, O Yahwè !  
 The righteous will rejoice that he has seen vengeance, 11  
 His feet will trample on the castles of the wicked ;  
 He will say, Verily expiated is the shed blood of the 12  
 righteous ;  
 Verily, there is a God who decides their cause with justice.

*Later insertion.*

- Let them dwindle like water in the desert, 8  
 Like grass let them fade away,  
 On the highway let them walk in obscurity, 9  
 Like owls which never see the sun.  
 Before they perceive +their danger+ let them be destroyed, 10  
 From their place let the storm-wind drive them away.

1. **O impious ones.** Cp. lxxxii. 2, and note on xiv. 1.—*O ye traitors.* Cp. lxxxii. l. 15.—3. *Deeds that bring ruin.* Cp. lxxxii. l. 14; ci. l. 4, and on xviii. 9—12.—7—10. *They err,* תָּעוּ, in a religious sense. Cp. תּוֹעָה, Isa. xxxii. 6, and תָּעָה to practise idolatry.—*Like a serpent's.* Cp. Sirach xxv. 15, and, on serpent-charming, Jer. viii. 17,

Eccles. x. 11, Sirach xii. 10. An Arabic proverb for obstinate resistance is, 'Answer not, serpent' (Meidani).

13—18. As so often, the moral crudity of M is due to corruption of the text. *Subvert the dwellings*, &c. A similar fate is foreseen for the castles of the rich in xlix. 12.—*The righteous, i.e.* faithful Israelites (xxxii. 11, xxxiii. 1, lxviii. 4, and often).

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. M עֲלֵם; 'A ἀλαλία 'in dumbness.' G J Σ φῦλον (Field) = לָאֵם; S omits. Most print אֵלִים (Lowth, Dathe, Ew., Ol., Del., Geiger, Gr., We., &c.); cp. Job xli. 1, JQR, '97, p. 579; v. 17, Gu., Schöpf., 55; Houb. אֱלֹהִים; Herz מֵאֱלֹהִים. But the obscurity of the sense produced is against it. In הַיָּאֲתָם הַנִּבְּלִים read הַיָּאֲתָם הַנִּבְּלִים. A close parallel for נִבְּלִים = נִמְעָלִים in xxvi. 8.—M בְּנֵי אָדָם. Read בְּנֵי אָדָם (cp. lxxxii. 15).



3 f. For **אָף** read **אָד** (Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Herz); see *ll.* 17 f. For **בִּלְב** read **בְּלִיעֵל** (ci. 3). **ב** and **ת** are relics of **דְּבָרִי**; **רִי=ת**. We., strangely, **בְּלִבּוֹל** 'confusion,' an abstract form from **בִּלְבַל**, cp. Aram. *bulbál*; Schwally (*ZATW*, xi. 259) **בִּיתְבִּל**; Duhm **בִּלְט** ('in secret').—M's **יִדְכֶם** does double duty for **צִדִּיקִים** and for **עֲדֵי חַם** [**בְּ**]. **בְּעֲדֵי חָמָס צִדִּיקִים תִּסְלַפּוּן**. Cp. Ex. xxiii. 1, 8.

7 f. For **זָרִי** read perhaps **נִזְרִי אַחֲוִיר**, completing the tetrameter, and removing the difficulty of **זָרִי**. See *SBOT*, 'Isaiah,' Heb., note on i. 4. For **דְּבָרִי** read **דְּבָרִי** (G, Bi.).

9. '**כְּדָמוֹת**' is impossible Hebrew. The two only instances of the adverbial use of the word (Is. xiii. 4, Ezek. xxiii. 15) refer to something which has a form; it is nowhere used of an abstract idea, which I take to be the case here. That there is something wrong with M, is evident from the facts that G does not represent the second **חֶמֶת**, and that **אִמָּם** only occurs elsewhere as a participle. G, *καὶ βουούσης τὰ ὄρα αὐτῆς*. I take the second **חֶמֶת** to be a correction after **כְּמִרְתָּ** had been corrupted into **כְּדָמוֹת** (Herz). Read **כְּמִרְתָּ** omit second **חֶמֶת**, and read **וְאִמָּם אֲזִנִּי**.

12. Read **חֶבְרִי חִוּבֵר חָכָם**; parallelism gains. G *φαρμάκου τε φαρμακευομένου παρὰ σοφου*. A word must have fallen out.

13 f. M **הָרֶס־שִׁנִּיכִי בִפִּימוֹ**; what crudity! Read **יְהִי הָרֶס** **אֲרָמְנוֹת כְּפָרִים**. **מִשְׁכְּנֹת מְחִירָה**.—M **מִלְתָּעוֹת כְּפִירִים**. Read **אֲרָמְנוֹת כְּפָרִים**. For **כְּפָרִים** see on xxxiv. 11.

16. Again frightful crudity. For **יֶרְחֵץ בְּדָם הָרָשָׁע** read **יֶרְמָסוּ אֲרָמְנוֹת הָרָשָׁע**; cp. Isa. xxvi. 6, and crit. n. on lxviii. 24. **אֲרָמְנוֹת** became mutilated through the vicinity of **וַיֹּאמֶר אִדָּם**.

17 f. The awkward **אִדָּם** needs correction. But so also does the vague **פָּרִי**. Read **אִדָּם יִכְפֹּר לְדָם צִדִּיקִים**.—For **שִׁפְטָם** read **שִׁפְטָם**, after G., with Gr., Herz, who stop short here, however. For **בָּאֲרִין** read **בְּצֶצֶק** (cp. *l.* 1); cp. on cxii. 8.

*Insertion* (cp. Isa. lix. 5-8). *Vz.* 8-10 should perhaps run thus:—

**יִפְסוּ כְּמִים בְּמִדְבָּר | כְּמוֹ חֲצִיר יִמְלוּ | בְּמִסְלָה יִהְלְכוּ בְּאֶפֶל |  
כִּתְנֵשְׁמֹת בִּלְחָזוֹ שְׁמֵשׁ | בְּטָרָם יִבְנוּ יִשְׁמְדוּ | בְּמִקְוֵמוֹ קָדִים יִשְׁעָרָם:**

The received text burdens a psalmist with the most repulsive words imaginable; it is also ungrammatical in form. And yet the fact that G knew nothing of the meaning 'snail' (*ὡσεὶ κηλὸς ὁ τακείς* are its words), should have suggested hesitation in appealing to the Targumic and New

Hebrew vocabulary, and the application of the passage, in its traditional form, in *Bereshith Rabba* (c. 51, beginning), to illustrate the fate of Sodom should have warned critics against a form of text which lent itself to such a use. No image, it was thought, could be low enough to represent the fate of such hateful sinners; so the snail (שֶׁבִּלּוֹל) is followed by the 'abortion' (נֶפֶל), and this by the 'mole' (אֵשֶׁת or אֵשֶׁת), which T marks off from נֶפֶל by ן. The analogy of other cases in which the received text gives some intolerably coarse or mean expression leads us to expect errors in the text. And we are not mistaken. The evidence of transposition and confusion of letters, and of dittography, is irrefragable. Notice especially the abundance of ל, and the repetition of כּמוּ, כּם, כּם. The mysterious שֶׁבִּלּוֹל comes from מִסְלּוֹל (Isa. xxxv. 8), which is itself corrupt, and should be מִסְלָה (see *SBOT* on Isa. l.c.). The latter point (מִסְלָה from 'ש') was first seen by Herz; the vicinity of יֵהָלֵךְ places it beyond doubt. Herz also saw that נֶפֶל must be a corruption of some word suggesting the same idea as בַּל חֲזוּ שֶׁמֶשׁ in the parallel line.<sup>1</sup>

To proceed. There should be only one כּמוּ—that in v. 8½, which is required by the metre. The כּמוּ in v. 8a is a dittogram. That in v. 9a comes from בּוּ in בּוּמִסְלָה (the original of שֶׁבִּלּוֹל); מ is also represented dittographically by ב. The two in v. 10, together with the כּם in סִרְתִּיכֶם, are fragments of כּמִקּוּמוּ. For the faulty spelling ימאסו compare ימאס, Job vii. 5 (see Budde). For במדבר, cp. Job vi. 18; for חציר ימ', cp. note on xc. 6; for באפל, cp. xci. 6, and especially Isa. lix. 9. יֵהָלֵכְוּ and יֵהָלֵכְוּ are variants. תִּמְס has a very singular origin. As in xxxix. 12 it is a fragment of תִּנְשַׁמֶּת, the name of a species of owl mentioned in Lev. xi. 18, Dt. xiv. 16. When תִּנְשַׁמֶּת had become corrupted past recognition, it was natural for the new exegetical tradition (Targ.; *Moed K.* 6b; *Ber. Rabba*, 51) to explain אֵשֶׁת as 'mole,' and B. Jacob (*ZATW*, '98, p. 292) revives this view, see 'Mole,' 'Owl,' *Enc. Bib.* סִרְתִּי and אִמְד are probably fragments of יִשְׁמְדוּ. On כּמוּ see above. חֲרוֹן is probably a miswritten קִרְיִים; ח and ק confounded, as in I S. viii. 16. The close of the description seems to be modelled on Job xxvii. 20 f.; cp. also lxxxiii. 14. We are thus relieved of the troublesome 'pots' and 'thorns,' to which Houb., Gr., and Du. add the 'thistle' (חֲרוֹל for חֲרוֹן). In confirmation of one part of this view, see on xxxix. 12 and Isa. lix. 10 (*SBOT*, *Isaiah*, Heb., 201 f.; cp. *JQR*, Oct. '97, p. 14).

<sup>1</sup> Herz's restoration of the whole passage is:—

יִרְדָּךְ חֲצִי בְּמִוֶּת יְמוּלְדִי | בְּמוֹ שְׁבִיל וּמִסְלּוֹת יֵהָלְכוּ אֶפְלוֹת בַּל חֲזוּ  
שֶׁמֶשׁ | בְּטֶרֶם יִבְנוּ סוּד יִכֶּם אִמְד בְּכוֹ חָפֶם וְחֲרוֹן יִשְׁעָרָן :

## PSALM LIX.

**T**RIMETERS. Again a much misunderstood psalm. Cp. Pss. lv., lvii.<sup>(1)</sup>, also lxxxiii. (see below on *vv.* 12, 14); note also the parallelism between *ll.* 15, 21, 23 and ii. 4, 5. It is evident that the seemingly unequal struggle between the Jews and the Edomites was regarded as typical of the great contest at the 'end'; see Ps. ii. in the corrected text, and cp. Isa. xxxiv. Observe that the reference to Israel's innocence (*vv.* 4*b* and 5*a* in M) disappears from our text; it was enough that freedom from guilt should be implied. Unless innocent, Israel could not have ventured to pray thus (cp. v. 8, lxi. 19).

*Deposited. Of Ethan the Ezrahite. Of 'Arab-ethan. A supplication.  
Concerning the Ishmaelites and the house of Jerahmeel (?)*. 1

- |    |  |               |
|----|--|---------------|
| 1  | Rescue me from the Arabians, O my God !              | 2             |
|    | Put me in safety from those of Jerahmeel,            |               |
|    | Snatch me from the workers of harm,                  | 3             |
|    | Deliver me from the men of blood.                    |               |
|    | For behold the Arabians crush me,                    | 4             |
|    | They are enraged, they array themselves against me ; |               |
|    | The Ishmaelites and Jerahmeelites,                   |               |
|    | Those of Edom and Miššur prepare themselves.         | 5 <i>a</i>    |
|    | But thou, O Yahwè! Šebaoth !                         | 6, 5 <i>b</i> |
| 10 | Awake +to come+ to meet me, and behold.              |               |
|    | Rouse thee to punish all the traitors,               |               |
|    | Pity not the workers of harm <sup>2</sup> .          |               |
|    | Behold, the Arabians insult me,                      | 8             |
|    | Those of Jerahmeel, Zarephath, and Ishmael.          |               |
|    | But thou, O Yahwè! laughest at them,                 | 9             |
|    | Thou mockest at all the traitors.                    |               |
|    | O my Rock ! to thee will I chant hymns,              | 10            |
|    | For thou, O Yahwè ! art my safe retreat.             |               |
|    | O my God ! let thy lovingkindness come to meet me ;  | 11            |
| 20 | O Yahwè ! cause me to behold the fate of Ishmael.    |               |
|    | Affright them, and they will eagerly seek thy face ; | 12            |
|    | By thy terrors make them fugitives ;                 |               |
|    | Pursue the traitors, O Lord,                         |               |
|    | Those of Jerahmeel and Zarephath ;                   | 13            |

<sup>1</sup> Elohim.<sup>2</sup> Asshur, Arabia, Jerahmeel (*v.* 7).

Let the traitors be taken [in their own net],  
And Ishmael be caught in his own snare,  
That they may perceive that the God of Jacob 14  
Rules to the +very+ bounds of the earth.<sup>1</sup>

And I will chant hymns to thy righteousness, 17  
30 And sing aloud at daybreak of thy lovingkindness,  
For thou hast proved to me a safe retreat,  
A refuge in my day of distress<sup>2</sup>

1-3. Similarly lvi. lines 1-3. In *workers of harm* and *men of blood* there is a covert allusion to the ethnic terms 'clans of On' and 'Edomites.' Cp. on xiv. 4, li. 16.—9. *Yahwè Sebaoth*. The forms, *Yahwè Elohim Sebaoth* (so M here, and in lxxx. 5, 20, lxxxiv. 9), and *Elohim Sebaoth* (M in lxxx. 8, 15), are of course due to the editor; *Elohim* is a correction of *Yahwè*.—10. *Awake*. Cp. on xlv. 24.—*Traitors*. See on ix. 6, and cp. l's. lxxxii. 8, where the wicked judges are perhaps called 'traitors'

(בגדים).—15. *Laughed at them*. Cp. ii. 4.—21-24. More parallels to Ps. ii. (see introd.). For parallels to 'eagerly seek thy face' see Ps. xviii. lines 101-104, and lxxxiii. lines 32-36 (just before, note רדף and ברהל); ii. 10-12 is also virtually parallel.—27 f. Cp. lxxxiii. 19.—30. *At daybreak*, לבקר. Cp. xxx. 6. Trouble is 'darkness'; prosperity is 'light' (Isa. ix. 2).—31. Cp. xlv. 2.

*Critical notes.* Title. The odd historical reference in the present title seems to have grown out of *עַל־יִשְׁמַעְאֵל וְעַל־יִרְחֻמָּאֵל*. Note the three or (virtually) four ל, and the three ש.

1. Read *הִלַצְנִי מֵעַרְבִים* (see l. 3). G varies the verbs; ἐξελού here, ῥῶσαι in l. 3). Note Pasek.

5. M *אָרְבוּ לִנְפְשִׁי*. Read *עַרְבִים שָׁפוּנִי*; cp. lvi. 2.

6. M *יְגִירוּ עָלַי עֲוִים*. Read probably *יִתְצִבּוּ עָלַי יְהוָה* (see on lvi. 6).

7 f. *יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים וִירְחֻמָּאֵלִים* should be *יִשְׁמַעְאֵל וִירְחֻמָּאֵל*. The editor constantly does his best to disguise these names. *יהודה בלי* (note Pasek) is another corrupt duplicate of *ירחמאלים*. *עון ירצון* should be *אדם ומצור*. Omit following ו.

9 f. Omit the glosses *אלהים* and *אלהי ישראל*, and transpose *עורה לק' וראה*.

11 f. Read *הַבְּגָדִים* (see on ix. 6); so l. 16. *בְּגָדִי* should rather be *פְּעָלִי* (l. 3); so G J. Observe that M recognizes 'ב', but in the wrong place. 'בגדי' was probably a marginal correction of *הַגָּדִים*, which

<sup>1</sup> Verses 7, 8 repeated.

<sup>2</sup> 'O my Rock . . . thy lovingkindness' (ll. 17-19).

ultimately lost the mark of abbreviation, and displaced פִּעְלִי in the text. סֵלָה is a corruption of יִרְחַמָּאל, which (cp. on l. 25 f.) stood in the margin as a correction of the miswritten עִיר (for 'יִרְחַ') at the end of v. 7.—The much disputed v. 7 reveals its secret. עֵרֶב, כִּכְלָב, and יִסּוּבָבוּ (see on lv. 11) are transparent. Rendered literally, the true text is 'Asshur, and Arabia, and Jerahmeel, and Asshur, and Arabia.' The two last names are dittographed. The three first are perhaps variants to those in l. 14; or it may be a gloss on ll. 11, 12.

13 f. M יִבְיְעוּ בְּפִיהֶם. Both We. and Du. question the verb, but בְּפִיהֶם is also doubtful. Read most probably עֲרִבִים חֲרָפוּנִי (corruptions all paralleled). Cp. on xciv. 4 (also corrupt). What follows in M is a singular transformation of יִרְחַמָּאִים וְצִרְפָּתִים וְשִׁמְעֵאִים. Cp. v. 16, which shows that חֲרָבוֹת comes from יִרְחַמָּאל.

17 f. The Vss. and most moderns, עָוִי (v. 18). But מָעֵז = עָוִי will hardly pass. צָרִי is indispensable (see on xxviii. 7).—M אֲשִׁמְרָה. Read אֲזַמְרָה (S, Houb., Kenn., Ol., Bi., Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Kau., Bā.). Read אֶתָּה כִּי (S, Gr.); also of course יִהְיֶה.

19 f. Neither אֱלֹהֵי חֲסִדוֹ (Kt., G, ἄλλος, JS) nor אֱלֹהֵי חֲסִדִּי (Kr., T, as v. 18) is satisfactory. Read אֱלֹהֵי חֲסִדְךָ. For idiom cp. lxxix. 8.—Read הֲרָאֵנִי (S), and, for בִּישְׁמֵעָאֵל, בִּישׁוּרִי (v. 9), or less probably בְּאִשׁוּרִים.

21. M אֶל־תִּהְרַגְם פֶּן־יִשְׁכַּחוּ עִמִּי (note Pasek after 'אֶל־ת'). A *crux interpretum*. Shortly after, M gives 'Consume (them) in wrath,' which is the contradictory of 'אֶל־ת'. Apart from this, how strange is the prayer that God would not slay the enemy lest the event should be forgotten! The plural יִשְׁכַּחוּ is also unexpected. Most suppose that 'at once' is to be supplied mentally; Duhm compares lviii. 8-9 (insertion). The sense is not improved by G. B. Gray's thoughtful suggestion (*JQR*, '97, pp. 183 f.) אֶל־תַּחַר תִּהְרַגְם 'make no delay in slaying them,' and metre is opposed to it. Let us turn then to the versions. Jerome (*Ep. ad Sun. et Fred.* 33) says, 'In Græco scriptum est, *legis tue*; sed in LXX. et in Hebræo non habet *populi tui*, sed, *populi mei*, et a nobis ita versum est.' But in the commentary in *Anecd. Maredsol.* (iii. 1) he renders, *ne forte obliviscantur nominis tui* (applying it to the Jews), and G<sup>mc.a.</sup> actually reads μή ποτε ἐπιλάβωνται τοῦ ὀνόματος σου. G<sup>b.</sup>, however, has . . . τοῦ νόμου σου, while Σ has . . . ὁ λαός σου, and 'A Θ give . . . τοῦ λαοῦ μου (al. σου). νόμου seems to be better than λαοῦ; it is a corruption of ὀνόματος. lxxxiii. 17 is manifestly parallel; cp. also ll. 30 f. of the same psalm. I do not indeed think that שָׁכַח (for עָמַי) is correct. The accus. of the verb underlies, not עָמַי (which comes from הִנֵּיעָמוּ), but פֶּן. Read תִּבְהִלֶּם וְיִשְׁחָרוּ פָנֶיךָ (cp. lxxxiii. 17).

22 ff. M הִנֵּיעֵמוּ בְּחִילָה. But חִיל is nowhere applied to Yahwè, and the words will hardly make a trimeter. Read בְּבִלְהִיתִיךָ.—M וְהוֹרִידֵנוּ מִגִּנְנוֹ. 'Our shield'? And before 'Adonai'? הוֹרִיד is also too strong. Read וְתִרְדֵּף בְּגָדִים. Cp. בְּגָאוֹנִים. The verb as in lxxxiii. 16.—חַטָּאת פִּימו comes from יִרְחַמְעָאִלִים (cp. פָּחִים, xi. 6), and וְצִרְפָּתִים from דְּבַר-שְׁפָתֵינוּ. Cp. on l. 7 f.

25 f. There is no parallel for M's text. Read בְּגָדִים [בְּרִשְׁתָּם] יִלְּ וְיִשְׁמָעֵאל בְּמוֹשָׁיו יִתְפַּשׁ סֵלָה. (v. 14) = מֶלֶח = יִרְחַמָּאֵל, a variant to יִשׁ. How can אֱלֹהִים and כָּחַשׁ be parallel, and סָפַר mean 'to speak'?

27 f. Read כִּי-אֱלֹהִים יַעֲקֹב מִזֶּלֶל ל (metre). M's opening words כִּי אֱלֹהִים כָּלָה בַּחֲמָה כָּלָה come out of כִּי אֱלֹהִים written twice too soon. Vv. 15 f. repeat v. 7, and (in a mutilated and still more corrupt form) v. 8.

29. M עֵינֶיךָ. Read probably צִדְקֶךָ (cp. on xviii. 3). ע, ז, and ד confounded.—V. 18 repetition (see above).

## PSALM LX.

TRIMETERS. The contents remind us partly of Ps. xlv.² and lxxxix.³ 39 ff., partly of the glowing pictures of the conquest of the N. Arabian border in Ps. ii. and xviii.; cp. also Am. ix. 11 f., Obad. 18–21 (note 'Zarephath'—the southern city of that name is meant; see 'Zarephath,' *Enc. Bib.*). The enormous corruptions of the text have caused great obscurity. Many critics since Ewald have supposed a composite origin of the psalm. So lately Duhm and especially Winckler, who (*Alttest. Unters.* 4, note; *AOF* i. 195; *Gesch. Isr.* ii. 204 ff.) divides the psalm into two parts—the former (made up of conventional phrases) due to a later writer called the Yahwist, the latter to an old Elohistic writer who was acquainted with the old historic tradition relative to David's conquests and in vv. 8–12 (apart from two small later insertions) gives what might be David's song of triumph over Aram-Zobah. In vv. 8 ff. he finds three N. Israelitish places, viz. Kadesh in Galilee, Shechem in Gilead (Num. xxvi. 31), and Emek-succoth (also trans-Jordanic). Cp. crit. note on l. 11. The inconsistencies of the psalm, however, are illusory. As to the date, Duhm disagrees with Ewald and Winckler, who find a pre-exilic element in the psalm; he refers both parts to the time of John Hyrcanus (a view which by anticipation is criticized in *OP* 96). In *OP* the present writer argued for an early Maccabean date (cp. Wellh. *Skizzen*, vi. 176), and if the Massoretic text could on the whole be trusted, it would be difficult not to accept this view or Duhm's, in spite of the objections urged by Beer (*Indiv.-ps.* p. lv.). The new position here taken up, however, precludes any such theory.

*Deposited. Of the Ethanites. [Of] 'Arab-ethan. At the oppression of Israel by Aram-jerahmeel and Aram-misur.*

1	O Yahwè ! thou hast cast us off and broken us,	3
	Thou art wroth with the remnant of thy people ;	
	Thou hast made the land quake, thou hast bruised it,	4
	Its rents do thou repair, for it totters.	

- Thy people thou hast sated with strong drink, 5  
 Wine that bewilders thou hast given us for a potion. • 6  
 Thou hast given us up to the Jerahmeelites, 6  
 Thou hast put us to shame because of the Cushites.  
 Redeem us from the oppression of the Aramites, 7  
 10 Deliver us from those of Jerahmeel.  
 For with thee I shall break Cush, 8  
 I shall divide Cusham and Maacath : <sup>1</sup>  
 I shall measure out <sup>2</sup> Mişsur and Asshur, 9, 10  
 I shall cast the cord upon Aram.<sup>3</sup>  
 Yahwè will conduct me +in triumph+ to Mişsur, 11  
 Yahwè will lead me +victorious+ unto Aram.  
 But now, O Yahwè ! thou hast cast us off, 12  
 20 Thou succourest not in our distresses.  
 Do thou grant us help against Mişsur, 13  
 Do thou become our succour against Aram.  
 With Yahwè we shall have the pre-eminence ; 14  
 It is he who will tread down the Mişrites.

2. Cp. lxxx. 5b (corr. text).—4. *Its rents.* Cp. Isa. iii. 6 f., xxx. 13.—6. *Wine that bewilders.* A conventional figure ; cp. lxxv. 9, Isa. li. 17, Jer. xxv. 15–17, xlix. 12, li. 7, Ezek. xxiii. 32–34, Zech. xii. 2.—7 f. There is no reference to a ‘banner’; the text is urgently in need of correction (see crit. n.). As usual, the N. Arabian

populations are the aggressors (cp. on Pss. xlv., lv., lxxxiii.).—11 ff. An allusion to ii. 9, xviii. 30, 49 (corr. text).—14. *Cast the cord*, as a form of lot (Mic. ii. 5).—17 f. Israel will ‘lead captive its captors.’ See introd.—20. So xlv. 10.—23. Idiom, as in cxviii. 15, 1 S. xiv. 58.

*Critical notes.* Title. See General Introduction. The contents of the psalm are so inappropriate that we have to account for the historical combination in the title, and we must do this on the basis of a *corrected* text. Originally the title must have referred, not to ‘Aram-naharaim’ and ‘Aram-zobah,’ but to Aram-jerahmeel and Aram-mişsur. The confusion of Zobah and Mişsur has also most probably been made in 2 S. viii., x., and it may be that the same writer is responsible for this in both cases. At any rate, the title of Ps. lx. has been harmonized with the later form of the story of David’s war with Hadad-ezer. Probably this harmonizing was suggested by the form of the original title. **בהצותו** (Pasek) must be a corruption of some other word, not of **בהכותו** (Klost., Wi.), for the **צ** is attested by G’s *ἐνέπικρεν*, but of some more suitable word. Read perhaps **בלחץ**; if **ל** became effaced, it was possible to regard **בהצ** (**בהצ**) as shortened from **בהצותו**, ‘when he strove.’ The initial corruption **לדוד** having

<sup>1</sup> For Gilead, for Manassch and Ephraim.

<sup>2</sup> Jerahmeel.

<sup>3</sup> On Zarephath.

already taken place, it was natural to read what followed in the light of the recast narrative in 2 S. viii., x.

2. M אנפת בנו ותשיבנו אחר = אַנְפַּת תְּשׁוּבָב לָנוּ (cp. Bā.). But is this possible? Most indeed take לָנוּ as a prayer, but this violates parallelism. The case (so far as תֵּשׁ is concerned) is parallel to that of תַּפְּלַת in lxxx. 5 (see note). Read בְּשִׂאֲרִית, and for לָנוּ read עִמָּךְ (ע became ל, מ became נו). אנפת should perhaps be תִּאֲנַף.

3 f. M פָּעַמְתָּה, 'hast cleft it'?? G συνετάραξας αὐτῆς = פָּעַמְתָּה? Cp. lxxxvii. 5, Gen. xli. 8 (ἐταράχθη). Rather פָּצַעְתָּה. Herz, פָּצַעְתָּה. —M רָפָה. Read רָפְאָה (xli. 5), with Houbigant.

5. M הִרְאִיתָ. Read הִרְוִיתָ (Zweifel, Gr., Lag., Du.). M קָשָׁה, not || to יִין. Read יִשְׁכַּר.

7 f. Evidently לְהַתְנַסֵּס, and קָשַׁט are wrong. Independently of v. Ortenberg, I formerly corrected נִס into פֶּס; cp. כּוֹס for נִס in cxvi. 13. See Jer. xxv. 15 f., which also suggests לְהַתְהוֹלֵל for 'להתנ'. G (?) S J take קָשַׁט as = קֶשֶׁת 'bow'; cp. Palmyrene קֶשֶׁמָּ 'archer,' and see Kön. ii. 26. Lag., שִׁטָּף; Wi., קָשָׁה (cp. v. 5, M). But we expect an ethnic name; cp. Lam. v. 9, where חֶרֶב should be עֶרְבִי. Read, comparing xlv. 12, לִירְחֻמָּאִים, הַבִּישׁוֹתָנוּ כִּפְנֵי כּוֹשִׁים נִתְּנָנוּ לִירְחֻמָּאִים. נִס comes from כּוֹשֵׁן, originally a marginal correction of קָשַׁט. ל may be the separated final of 'יר, but note that, as elsewhere (e.g. lix. 6, 14), סֶלָה here represents מֵאל or מֵאִלִּים in 'יר. ט for כּ was an easy error of the scribe.

9. M G יִדְרִידָן יִחְלֶצֶן יִדְרִידָן. Against parallelism. Read נֶאֱלָנוּ מִלֶּחֶץ אֲדָמִים.

10. M הוֹשִׁיעָה יְמִינִךְ וַעֲנֵנוּ אֱלֹהִים. Kr. עֲנֵנוּ. After אֱלֹהִים (misplaced in v. 8) stands Pasek. יְמִינִךְ is a riddle. In S. ix. 4 יְמִינִי represents יִרְחֻמָּאִים. Similarly here read מִיִּרְחֻמָּאִים (cp. on lxxx., l. 35, xc., l. 23). The proof is the occurrence of אֱלֹהִים just afterwards, which throws v. 8 into confusion, and (as sometimes elsewhere) is a miswritten יִרְחֻמָּאִים. וַעֲנֵנוּ is a fragment of הוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ (correction). Note the three נ near together, which ought to awaken suspicion.

11. M בְּקִדְשׁוֹ אֵעֲלֶה אֲחִלָּקָה (Pasek after אֱלֹהִים). A combination of difficulties. בְּקִדְשׁוֹ 'in his sanctuary'? or 'in his holiness'? or '(swearing) by his holiness'? אֵעֲלֶה; what is the subject of the verb? Yahwè (Ol., Hu., Bā.)? or David (Del.)? or the people? And



can אֵלֶזָה be rightly conjoined with אַחֲלָקָה and אַמְדָּר? Clearly there is corruption. Lag. proposes אֵעֶזָה; but this is not enough. Winckler, אֲחֶזָה, 'I will seize Kadesh.' David, he thinks, is boasting of his victories, and tells us that by his war with Zobah he became master of Kadesh (in Galilee), and secured his possession of Manasseh, Gilead, and even Ephraim. Would not מִקְדֵּשׁ אֵעֶלָה 'I (Israel) should go up from Kadesh (in the south)' be more plausible? Kadesh is not mentioned in the account of David's wars in 2 S. viii., x., but the southern Kadesh is mentioned in that of Israel's early migration. This Kadesh, too, would harmonize with Miššur and Edom in v. 11 (if correctly read). The truth is, however, that the later editor made a colossal mistake, which can only be rectified by applying to this psalm the same key which has been so successful elsewhere. It will be simplest to give the results of a keen textual criticism connectedly.

כִּי־בָד אֶרֶץ כּוּשׁ  
 אַחֲלָקָה בְּשֵׁם וּמַעֲבָת  
 אַמְדָּר מִצּוֹר וְאַשּׁוּר  
 אֲשֶׁלֶּיךָ חָבֵל עַל־אֲרָם  
 יִהְיֶה יוֹבְלִנִי עַד־מִצּוֹר  
 יִהְיֶה יִנְחֲנִי עַד אֲדוֹם

As in the case of 'Asshur, Arabia, and Jerahmeel' in Ps. lix., the proper names here have been repeated in different forms by puzzled scribes. Note, however, first that the key to בַּקְדָּשׁוֹ אֵעֶל is furnished by lxiv. 3 (וכוּשׁ = בַּקְדָּשׁ). מַעֲבָת represents a twice-written סַבּוֹת. Then follows a gloss, 'for Gilead, for Manasseh and Ephraim' (read לְגִלְעָד), i.e. for tribes of Israel so-called. מִצּוֹר is repeated afterwards as מַעֲוֹ; אֲשּׁוּר = אֲשּׁוּר (variant); יְהוּדָה and מַחֲקִי are corruptions of יִרְחַמְאֵל, written perhaps in the margin as a gloss upon אֲשּׁוּר. מוֹאָב (M) is followed by פַּסֶּק; as sometimes in Samuel it is miswritten for מִצּוֹר, of which name (or else of the synon. אֲשַׁחוּר) סִיר and רַחְצִי are also corruptions. נַעֲלִי, as parallelism suggests, comes from חָבֵל (see Mic. ii. 5). הַתְּרוּעָה (in Ps. cviii. אֲתִרְעָע) comes from צִרְפָּתִים, a gloss on פִּלְשֶׁת, i.e. צִרְפָּת, itself a gloss on אֲרָם (see 'Zarephath,' *Enc. Bib.*); parallel in lxv. 14. We thus get rid of the problems of 'Shechem' and the 'valley of Succoth' (G τῆν κοιλιάδα τῶν σακκῶν), also of the enigmatical 'washpot' and 'casting out of the shoe,' which Del. and others wildly support by a Persian and an Abyssinian custom respectively. See 'Shoe,' 'Shechem,' 'Succoth,' *Enc. Bib.* Note that G could make no sense of סִיר רַחְצִי; λέβης τῆς ἐλπίδος μου implies that

רחץ is used *Aramaic* for בטח (perf. in T, cxv. 10 f.; cxviii. 10 f.); עיר מצור for עיר-מצור is required by the sense; also יציר מבצר (in Ps. cviii., יציר מבצר). The latter is due to Wi. (cp. on xxxi. 22), and ינחני (for נחני) to Ol.; G ὁδηγῶσαι με.

19 f. Read וַעֲתָה יְהוָה וְנִ (cp. on lxxxix. 39). הלא is miswritten for אלהים; the first scribe wrote it too soon, and left the word undeleted: there is also a superfluous אלהים in v. 12b. In l. 20 read תִּשְׁעֶ בְּצִרְתֵּינוּ as in xliv. 10b.

21. Read מִמְּצָר.—22. Read וְהָיָה תְּשׁוּעָתִי מֵאֶרֶם. 24. Read מִצָּרִים.

## PSALM LXI.

Ps. lxi. appears to be composite. The situation presupposed in vv. 2 and 3, and also the metre, differ from those in vv. 6-9. Ps. lxi. consists of pentameters. It is a short wail of persecuted Jews who long for the joy and the safety of Yahwè's sanctuary, but are at present in the 'land of the Jerahmeelites.' Ps. lxi.<sup>(2)</sup> is composed of trimeters. It is spoken by the congregation which worships in the temple, and expresses its gratitude for a past deliverance from the Jerahmeelites and a sure confidence that while Israel will be preserved for ever its foe Jerahmeel will be destroyed. The psalm as a whole would possess unity of thought, were it not for the perfect in v. 3; it might then be compared with Pss. xlii.-xliii. and lxiii. The prophecy of the destruction of Jerahmeel agrees with ii. 9, lxiii. 12, cx. 5-7; that of Israel's perpetual duration with xxi. 5, xci. 16, cx. 4.

Textual criticism has to a great extent transformed this psalm. Critics have wondered who the king in this post-exilic poem (v. 7 in M G) can be. Sellin (*Serubbabel*; cp. *Studien*, 1901, pp. 187 ff.) thinks of Zerubbabel, who for a time (according to him) assumed the royal title; Hitzig of Seleucus Nicator; the present writer (*OP* 99) of Jonathan or rather Simon the Maccabee; Giesebrecht (*ZATW*, i. 326) of Aristobulus; while Beer (*Indiv.-ps.* xlix.) holds that some non-Israelitish king, and Duhm that some Asmonæan king is meant. It has also been questioned whether the persecuted Jews for whom the psalmist speaks were sojourning in a distant land like Lydia or Phrygia (Jos. *Ant.* xii. 3, 4) or in some part of Palestine which was then in heathen occupation. The former view is the more plausible. It is true the phrase chiefly relied upon ('from the end of the earth,' v. 3, M) happens to be corrupt, but if we take Ps. lxi.<sup>(1)</sup> together with Ps. xlii.-xliii. we shall see that the real or assumed situation of the speaker is that of an unwilling sojourner in the far south of Palestine in Jerahmeelite (*i.e.* Edomite) territory. For the interesting theory of Roy, as well as on other important points, see introd. to Ps. xlii.-xliii. Notice also the parallelism between v. 1 (נֶעַר) and xlii. 2, lxxxiv. 3, between v. 2 and xliii. 1, 3 (corr. text), and between v. 7 and xliii. 3a; also between v. 1a and xvii. 1, cxlii. 7; between v. 4 and xv. 1, xxvii. 10; between v. 5b and xxi. 3b, ii. 8 (שָׁאֵל); between v. 7 and ii. 9, lxxxiii. 7, 8, 10, cx. 5-7, and between v. 9b and l. 23 (corr. text).

## LXI.—I (a fragment).

*Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Of 'Arab-ethan.*

- 1 Hear my wail, O Yahwè! | attend to my prayer. 2  
I cry in pain toward thy sanctuary, | toward thy habitation.  
From the land of the Jerahmeelites | do thou lead me, [O  
Yahwè!]

\* \* \* \*

LXI.—2 (*a fragment*).

I	For thou hast proved a refuge to me,	4
	A strong tower against the Arabian.	
	May I be a guest in thy palace, O Yahwè !	5
	May I find refuge in the covert of thy wings !	
	For thou hast heard my wail,	6
	Thou wilt grant Israel's request.	
	He will shatter Jerahmeel and Zarephath,	7
	He will beat them down like Moab and Midian.	
	He will abide before Yahwè for ever,	8
10	Lovingkindness and faithfulness will preserve him.	
	I will chant hymns to thy name for ever,	9
	Performing my vows to Yahwè.	

*Critical Notes.* (lxi.<sup>(1)</sup>). 2. The enigmatical **מַקְצָה הָאָרֶץ** (Pasek follows) should, as the || passages show, be **מִקְדָּשֶׁךָ** [**אֵל**] (or **לֵא**); transposition of letters. **אֶקְרָא** should be **אֶנְעֵר** (see crit. n. on xlii. 2). —M **בְּעֵטֶפְ לְבִי**; too vague. Read **לְמִשְׁבְּנֶתֶיךָ**. **ש = ע ; מ = בִּי**. **לְמִשְׁבְּנֶתֶיךָ**. **נ = ד ; ת = ט ; כ = ב** fell out. Cp. xliii. 3, lxxxiv. 2.

3. M **בְּצוּרֵי־רִים מְמַנִּי**; clearly impossible. If this were not a prayer, we might read **מִמְצוֹר יִשְׁמְרֵנִי**; cp. on xxvii. 5b. A not less easy and more suitable correction is **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**; see introd. G S imply **תִּרְחַמְנִי**; is not this a conjecture? Insert **י** (יהוה), now absorbed in

(lxi.<sup>(2)</sup>). 2. **אֹיִב** should, as often, be **עֶרְבִי**. — 3. M **בְּהִיכְלֶךָ**; see on xv. 1, xxvii. 5.—M **עֲלֵמִים**, as in lxxvii. 6, 8, cxlv. 13. The sense here is not good; protection, not protection for ever, is in the writer's mind. **סְלָה**, at the end of v. 5, represents **אֱלֹהִים**, and this (or rather יהוה) is the right reading. **אֱלֹהִים** and **עוֹלָם** are elsewhere confounded.—5. M **נִדְרֵי**. Rather **רִנָּתִי**. The 'wail' or 'cry for help' was extorted by Israel's sufferings from the Jerahmeelites. It was accompanied by a request for the final subjugation of Israel's enemies in the Messianic age.—6. M **נָתַתְּ**. Rather **תָּתַתְּ**.—M **יִרְשָׁתְּ**, 'possession'; Kr., Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, **אֶרְשָׁתְּ**. But **אֶר** in xxi. 3 is corrupt. Read **מִשְׁאֲלֶת**.—M **יִרְאֵי שְׁמֶךָ**. The expression produces a tetrameter. For **יִרְאֵי** read **יִשְׂרָאֵל**. The **ש** dropped out owing to **ש** in **שְׁמֶךָ**. See next note.

7. M **שָׁמַךְ : יָמִים עַל־יְמֵי־מָלְךְ תּוֹסִיף**. The opening of *v.* 7 is strangely expressed ; contrast *xxi.* 5. Read **יִמְחֹץ יִרְחֲמָאֵל וְצָרְפֶּת**. Cp. *lxiii.* 12, *cx.* 6, *lxviii.* 22, *ii.* 9 (corr. text).

8. M **שְׁנוּתָיו בְּמִדְרֹךְ וָדֹר**, not natural. Read probably **יִתְצֵם יִתְצֵם בְּמוֹאֵב וּבְמִדְיָן** (מ = נו).

10 f. M **בֵּן עֲצֵרוֹהוּ**. None of the ancients connected **בֵּן** with **מִנְה**. It probably comes from a dittographed **מִדְיָן**. **בֵּן** in *v.* 9 seems to be a conjectural correction of **מִן** from the margin, and **יוֹם יוֹם** (separated by *Pasek*) to be a corruption of **לְאֱלֹהִים**, which in turn is an editorial substitute for **לִיהוָה**.

## PSALM LXII.

**PENTAMETERS.** Pious Israel is weary of incessant insults, and of the violent contrast between its own moral ideas and those of its opponents. It waits patiently on Yahwè. The great day of retribution is at hand ; then, its enemies will vanish. Scepticism is earnestly deprecated ('let it not goad your heart' cp. *lxxiii.* 21) on the ground that Ishmael's punishment will be according to his deserts. The five times repeated **אֵךְ** ('only,' *i.e.* 'absolutely, altogether') is not merely an external characteristic of this psalm (cp. *xxxix.* 12, *lxxiii.* 13) ; it points to a peculiar spiritual quality. Israel's religion is absolute devotion to God ; it is marked by *πληροφροῖα* of faith and hope (*Heb.* *vi.* 11 ; *x.* 22).

Reuss is the only critic who has applied the personification-theory here. Even Smend (*p.* 120) thinks that some leader of pious Israel must be intended, because of *vv.* 4 f. in M's text. But a thoroughly corrected text justifies Reuss. The psalm is parallel to *Pss.* *lii.*, *lv.*, except that the expression of feeling here is calmer ; also to *Pss.* *iv.* and *v.* Duhm would even assign *Pss.* *iv.* and *lxii.* to the same author—a high priest. On *P.* *lxii.*, see further *OP*, 121, 134.

*Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan. Marked.*

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Wait altogether on Yahwè, my soul,   for from him +will<br>come+ my expectation :    | 2 |
|   | He altogether is my rock of deliverance,   my retreat<br>+where+ I am secure.        | 3 |
|   | How long will ye meditate insults,   will ye whisper together<br>against the pious ? |   |
|   | Your heart is as an open sepulchre,   though flatteringly<br>ye talk.                | 4 |
|   | Altogether deeds of guilt do they plan,   though they love<br>to flatter ;           | 5 |
|   | With the mouth they bless their companion,   but<br>inwardly they curse.             | • |

Wait altogether on Yahwè, my soul, | for from him +will  
 come+ my expectation : 6  
 He altogether is my rock of deliverance,—my retreat +where+  
 I am secure.<sup>1</sup>

Altogether vanity are the sons of Jerahmeel, | an illusion  
 the sons of Ishmael ; 10  
 10 When Jerahmeel prevails, | let it not goad•your heart.<sup>2</sup> 11b

Be not ye incensed at the oppressor, | and rage ye not  
 against the robber, 11a  
 For the Lord [Yahwè] will requite | Ishmael according to  
 his work. 13

1. **אַךְ**. See introd.—**דָּמִי**. Rest in the hope of the 'end' (Messianic) ; 'quiet as a nun breathless with adoration' (Wordsworth). Cp. xxxvii. 7, Lam. iii. 26.

2. **Rock—retreat**. Cp. lix. 10, 17.—3-5. Cp. iv. 3, v. 10, xxxviii. 13, xli. 8, lii. 3, 4, 9, iv. 12, 22.

6. **They curse**. Cp. cix. 18-20.—9. *Vanity*. Elsewhere this is applied to man in general (xxxix. 6 (?), cxliv. 4); here, to the Jerahmeelite community,

which is to be annihilated in the Messianic age (ii. 9, &c.).

10. **Goad your heart**, viz. to give up the fear of God (cp. xxxix., lxxiii., cxvi.).

12. **Incensed** (תַּתְּחַרֵּי), as in xxxvii. 1, 7, 8, Prov. xxiv. 19.—*Rage not*. Cp. Eccles. vii. 7.—*Robber* (גֹּזֵל); cp. Ezek. xviii. 18, Eccles. v. 7.—12. *According to his work*. Cp. Obad. 15, 'As thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee,' cxxxvii. 7 f.

*Critical Notes.* 1 f. Read אֶחָד־לִיָּהּ (cp. ז'. 6).—M דְּמִיָּה. Read דָּמִי (Bi., Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We., Du.), supply כִּי, and read תִּקְוֹתִי (ז'. 6); 'יש' came from ז'. 3.—Read צִוֵּר יְשׁוּעָתִי (so l. 15).—M G's רָבָה (ז'. 3, end) is wrong, 'ר' being nowhere used as an adverb. See next note.

3. M עֲרֵאנָה תִּהְיוּתָנוּ : רָבָה (Pasek after אָנָה). Combine רָבָה with תִּהְיוּתָנוּ, and seek for the underlying words. The most probable result is תִּהְיוּ חֲרָפוֹת, cp. הָנָה, xxxviii. 13); חֲרָפוֹת, however, comes to us through an intermediate הָיוּת (see on v. 10, lii. 3).—M תִּרְצָחוּ (Baer, Gi.), or תִּרְצָחוּ (Bä., Dri.), plainly corrupt. We.'s תִּרְצָחוּ is no more than ingenious. We must take the word together with עַל־אִישׁ, which is also wrong. Parallelism and kindred passages (see exeg. note) guide us to עַל־חֲסִיד תִּתְּלַחֲשׁוּ.

<sup>1</sup> Yahwè is my deliverance, my glory ; | my rock of refuge is Yahwè. 8  
 Trust in him at all times, ye sufferers ! | our refuge is God. [Pour out your heart before him.]

<sup>2</sup> Jerahmeelites and Ishmaelites are one and the same thing.

4. M **בְּלִכְּם בְּקִיר נָטְיָה נָדָר הַדְּחוּיָה**. According to the ancients, a prediction of the punishment for the wicked (cp. Isa. xxx. 13). This is against the context. The parallel part of the next stanza (l. 6), however, has been neglected. *Now* we see that there is an allusion to v. 10. **נָדָר** is an interesting corruption of **נִרְנָכֶם**, and **כֻּלְּכֶם** (misplaced) of **לְשִׁנְכֶם** through **נִשְׁלַכְּם**. Read **בְּקִבֵּר פֶּתִיחַ נִרְנָ[כֶם] תַּחֲלִיקוּ לְשִׁנְכֶם**.

5. M **מִשְׁאֲתֹי**; \*G **τιμήν μου** (= **שְׁאִיתִי**), rejecting **כו** because it was noticed that **לַהֲדִיחַ** had no suffix. This observation is important; it throws suspicion on the text (Pasek follows 'מש'). Gunkel (*Schö.*, 33) reads **מִשְׁאֲתֹי**; too strong, also too uncommon a word. Read **אֲשָׁמוֹת**. —M **לַהֲדִיחַ**, no suffix; besides, more suitable when divine judgments are spoken of (v. 11). Read **לַהֲחִלִּיק** (cp. on l. 4).

6. **בָּזֹב**. Insight into metre helps us here. **בָּזֹב** should be the object of **יִבְרַכֵּי**. Read **חָבֵר**; **כ** and **ח**, **ז** and **ר** confounded. In G read, not *ἐν δίσσει*, but *ἐν ψεύδει* (Ens.).—M **בְּפִיּוֹ**. Read **בְּפִיהֶם** (see on v. 10).

Verses 8, 9 are a later homiletical insertion; indeed, the bracketed words, which in the Hebrew are metrically incorrect, seem to be a still later interpolation. G's *πᾶσα συναγωγὴ λαοῦ* (cp. Bā.) suggests **כָּל-עֲדַת עָם**, which several (e.g. Bā., Bertholet) accept. But it is **עָם**, which is wrong (note Pasek); read **עַנִּיִּים**. In v. 8 omit **עַל** (from a dittographed **אֵל**), and **עָנִי**—a variant to **צָרִי**. Read, however, **צוֹר** (l. 3). **סֵלָה** comes from **אֱלֹהִים**, the place of which was variously given.

9. M **בְּנִי-אִישׁ, בְּנִי-אָדָם**, 'mean men,' 'great men'? The maxim produced is trite and unsuitable. Read **יִשְׁמְעָאֵל, בְּנִי יִרְחֻמָּאֵל**. **יִרַח** in **יִרְחֻמָּאֵל** is, in fact, preserved at the end of v. 10, for the words **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל יְחַד בְּמַאֲזֵנִים לַעֲלוֹת הֵמָּה** are a very corrupt dittogram of **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל, בְּנִי = הֵמָּה, ש = ז, נִי = מ. בְּנִי יִשְׁמְעָאֵל בְּנִי יִרְחֻמָּאֵל = יִרַח = יְחַד, מַאֲל**. The text as it stands gives no sense. G *ἐν ζυγοῖς τοῦ ἀδικῆσαι* (לְעוֹלָה); J *in stateris dolosis*. Why did they not guess **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל** (cp. Isa. xxxviii. 8)?

10 f. Transposition of v. 11a and v. 11b, to improve connexion. M **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל** (Pasek after **יְחַד**); G *πλοῦτος ἐν ῥέῃ* (= **יְחַד**) again in xcii. 15, Prov. xxxi. 10, and (Pilel) Zech. ix. 17, but suspicious in each case. In Prov. l.c. read **יְחַד** (Gr.; cp. G), and in Zech. l.c. **יְחַד** (as in x. 6, 12). Read here **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל**. **יִרְחֻמָּאֵל** has a two-fold representation, 1. by **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל**, which is a confusion of **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל** (see presently) and **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל** (a mutilated **יְחַד מַהְבֵּל**), 2. by **יְחַד**.—M **אֵל-תִּשְׁתִּי לֵב**;

extremely weak. Read אֶל־תִּבְמָחוּ — M אֶל־תִּבְמָחוּ; influenced by *v.* 9, or by Isa. xxx. 12? Read אֶל־תִּתְחַרְרוּ (xxxvii. 1).—M עֲשֶׂק, תִּתְחַרְרוּ. Read עֲשֶׂק, נָזַל. תִּתְחַרְרוּ (see last note but one).

*V.* 12 is a gloss. Read אֶחָת יִרְחֲמָאִים וְיִשְׁמְעָאִים again and again stands for מֵאִים or מַעֲאִים. Afterwards (*v.* 13a) יִרְחֲמָאִים comes in once more, a corrupt dittogram. Can the usual translation of *v.* 12 commend itself to any one?

12. M כִּי־אֶתָּה. Read כִּי־אֶדְנִי (cp. on xci. 9).—M תִּשְׁלֹם. Read יִשְׁלֹם.—M לְאִישׁ. Read לְיִשְׁכָּעָאֵל; מַעַל fell out owing to יִשְׁלֹם close by.

### PSALM LXIII.

**TRIMETERS.** Again a much misunderstood psalm, from the title onwards, though the misunderstanding does not at all affect the leading idea, which is that pious Jews, at a distance from the sanctuary, and in peril of their lives, call upon Yahwè to restore to them their priceless spiritual privileges. Only at the close of the psalm does the spokesman refer to the Jerahmeelites and the misery which they cause, and the vehement language which the common text ascribes to him gives place in the true text to a simple assertion that Yahwè will certainly annihilate this dangerous people, and that Israel will praise its God for His goodness in the temple. The psalm is parallel to Ps. xxxvi.<sup>(2)</sup>, to Pss. xlii.—xliii. (though that psalm describes more acute sufferings), and to Pss. lxi. and lxxxiv.

As in Ps. xlii.—xliii. the speaker is, not any individual, but a company of Jews living (really, or in the poet's imagination) among Jerahmeelite oppressors. *V.* 7 (*ll.* 11 f.), which may appear opposed to this view (cp. Coblenz, 86), is parallel to passages in xlii.—xliii., and only shows the strength of the personification (cp. Smend, 121). The unity of feeling in any representative company of faithful Jews is such that any experience common to all its members in virtue of their religious standing as Israelites can be and is ascribed to the company.

It is a beautiful though by no means original psalm, and benefits much from textual criticism. The excision of the violent expressions respecting the slaughter of the enemies should be a great relief to readers. The removal of 'the king' in *v.* 12a (see crit. n. on *l.* 12) is also no small gain. If correct, it would have to be a reference to the Messiah; a reference to some member of the Asmonæan family is not, in our present stage of critical study, defensible. See *Jew. Rel. Life*, 105 (but cp. *OP* 99); Toy, *JBL*, lviii. ('99), 162, who admits the 'reality' of the 'king' in Ps. lxi., but not in Ps. lxiii.

*Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. At the goings up to the house of Yahwè. 1*

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | O Yahwè! for thy courts I seek,                      | 2 |
|   | My soul thirsts for thy habitation ;                 |   |
|   | As a gazelle longs for running streams,              | 3 |
|   | +So+ long I for thy glorious courts.                 |   |
|   | For thy lovingkindness is better than wine,          | 4 |
|   | And thy faithfulness than all spices ;               |   |
|   | For beside thee is the fountain of life,             | 5 |
|   | Wah the stream of thy delights thou wilt refresh me. |   |

For thou wilt satisfy my longing with fatness, 6  
 10 And wilt fill me with a feast of delicacies ;  
 As for me, I think of thee upon my couch, 7  
 I muse upon thee in the night-watches.

Thou hast proved thyself a helper unto me, 8  
 And under the shadow of thy wings I shall abide.  
 Eagerly does my soul run after thee ; 9  
 Let thy right hand uphold me !

O Yahwè! the Ishmaelites crush me, 10  
 The hosts of Miššur trample upon me ;  
 Those of Jerahmeel are enraged at me, 11  
 20 Those of Maacath and of Ishmael.

Yahwè will shatter the Jerahmeelites, 12  
 \* \* \* \*

Every one that swears by Him will triumph,  
 For he will celebrate His work in the sanctuary.

*Critical Notes.* Title. The very inappropriate title may have for a basis יהוה בֵּית בְּמַעֲלוֹת (or בְּהַלְכֹת). The *ἰσθμιας* of G B and Θ is miswritten for *ισθδαας*.

1. Read יהוה לְחֻצְרֹתֶיךָ אֲשַׁחֵר. M's אֵלֵי אַתָּה is plausible (cxl. 7), but the stichus produced is not symmetrical with the rest. Note Paseḳ after אֱלֹהִים.

2. Read לְמִשְׁכְּנֹתֶיךָ צָמָאָה נַפְשִׁי. M's כְּמָה לֶךְ בִּשְׂרִי is an editor's attempt to make sense of an indistinctly or imperfectly written לְמִשְׁכְּנֹתֶיךָ; note Paseḳ after the first לֶךְ. A verb כָּמָה would be a ἄπ. λεγ. with no derivatives. A connection is fancied with Ar. and Syr. roots meaning 'to be pale-faced, weak-eyed, or blind.' G Θ E' do not recognize the root, and vocalize כָּמָה. T רָנִיג; cp. on xlii. 2; Σ *λείπεται*; J *desideravit*, representing a second not less faulty tradition.

3. Read כָּצְבִיָּה לְאַפְיִי מִים (cp. xlii. 2). 'צב as in Cant. iv. 5, vii. 4. צִיָּהב became in M וְעִפְלִי; כָּצְבִיָּה became בארץ and also צִיָּהב ('צ was dittographed, and both forms became corrupted). Houb.'s correction, בארץ for כארץ, is too superficial, and unless, with Gr., we arbitrarily read עִפָּה, we have still the difficulty of a masculine adjective (according to the common view of צִיָּה) coupled with a fem. Of the passages quoted in Ges.<sup>(26)</sup> (§ 132*d*) to justify this, three (1 K. xix. 11, 1 S. xv. 9, and the present passage) should certainly be corrected. The fourth (Jer. xx. 9) stands apart, עָצָר not having a prefixed נ. No is the



difficulty of the phrase lessened by the admission that צִיָּה is not an adjective, but a substantive ('dryness'). If we might, with Duhm, excise עָיָה as a variant to צִיָּה (a most arbitrary proceeding), we might read, for בלי מים, ליבלי מים. But we certainly *expect* some animal to be mentioned; צִבְּיָה is our imitative psalmist's substitute for the אֵילת of xlii. 2.

4. Read נִכְסַפְתִּי לְחֻצְרוֹת כְּבוֹדֶךָ. M's לראות עוד arises out of לרותחך; בקדש חזיתך presents three superfluous letters—a second sibilant (ת), a second palatal (ק), and a ד. Apart from these superfluities (partly due to scribes, partly [ד] to an editor), we find a close approach to the letters of נִכְסַפְתִּי. כֵּן is here omitted as dittographic (נכ follows).

5. מִיָּחִיִּים. The sense generally given to this statement (not congenial to Jewish thought) has no ancient support; T discovers a contrast between the *eternal* life of the righteous and that of the wicked. Read certainly מִיָּוֶן (Cant. i. 2, iv. 10).

6. M שִׁפְתֵּי יִשְׁבַּחוּנֶךָ. The connexion is rough; the idea poor. Note also the masc. verb with the fem. noun. Read most probably וְאַמְתָּךְ מִכָּל-בְּשָׁמַיִם (cp. Cant. iv. 10). If מכל was written in error after בשמים, ב would easily fall out. ל remains unaccounted for; it must have become effaced.

7 f. M בְּנוֹ אֲבָרְכֶךָ בַּחַיִּי. Sense and parallelism disappoint us again. Read כִּי עֲמֹךְ מְקוֹר חַיִּים (xxxvi. 10a). The skill of the editor was great; he produced an edifying though not a perfectly suitable sense.—M וּבְשִׁמְךָ אֵשָׁא כִּפִּי. Read probably וְנִחַל שְׁמִיךָ תִּשְׁקֵנִי; וְנִחַל fell out after בדוי. Cp. xxxvi. 9, lxv. 10, xxiii. 5.

9 ff. M כִּי חֶלֶב יִדְשֶׁן תִּשְׁבַּע נֶפְשִׁי. Long and tautological. Read כִּי מִחֶלֶב תִּדְשֶׁן נֶפְשִׁי. Cp. on xxiii. 5.—M וְשִׁפְתֵּי רִנָּנוֹת. וְשִׁפְתֵּי רִנָּנוֹת is not used in plural. Strange and tautological. Read וּמִשְׁתָּה שְׁמָנִים תִּמְלִאֲנִי (see Isa. xxv. 6).

13-16. Omit בִּי, due to dittography.—M אֲרִנֵּן, unsuitable. Read אֲתִלֹּן (xci. 1), with Gr. Du., infelicitously, אֲקִנֵּן.—M דָּבָרָה. But בִּי should follow. Read דָּלָהָה (1 S. xiv. 22).—M בִּי תִמְכָּה. Read בִּי יִתְמָךְ. Similarly Gr.

17-24. וְהִמָּה לְשׂוֹאָה is obscure. G εἰς μάτην = לְשׂוֹאָה; improbable. וְהִמָּה לְשׂוֹאָה, 'to deliver up,' is suspicious. וְהִמָּה לְשׂוֹאָה? If the general form of the passage is right, some word descriptive of personal character

is to be expected. Gr. proposes עֲבָדָךָ; Toy, צִדִּיק. But the whole passage is suspicious. Evidently the editor has reconstructed it, either because he wished to get rid of the historical colouring, or because the passage was indistinctly written, or perhaps for both reasons. The following may be a near approximation to the true text, judging from many analogous passages :—

17	יהוה [אלהים] יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים שְׁפוּנִי	10
	יְבוֹסוּנִי מִחֲנוֹת מִצּוֹר	
	יִרְגְּזוּ עָלַי יִרְחֲמֵאלִים	11
	מִעֲבָתִים וּיִשְׁמְעֵאלִים	
	יִרְחֲמֵאלִים יִמְחֹץ יְהוה [אלהים]	12
	* * *	
	יִתְהַלֵּל כָּל־הַנֶּשֶׁבַע בּוֹ	
24	כִּי יִזְכִּיר פִּעְלוֹ בְּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ	

## PSALM LXIV.

**T**RIMETERS. Fresh complaints and anticipations of the day of retribution. Those of the Jerahmeelites (surely no mere slanderers, but skilled archers) who survive are to repent. Cp. Pss. vii., x., xi., lii., lviii., lxxxiii. end; the phraseological points of contact are obvious (see crit. notes).

*Deposited. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

1	Hear my voice, O Yahwè ! in my complaint, Protect me from the sword of the Arabian ; Hide me from the violence of evil-doers, From the raging of workers of harm.	2 3
	The Ishmaelites sharpen their sword, The Arabians bend their bow ; They lie in wait in coverts for the upright, Suddenly they shoot at him, fearing not.	4 5
10	The Jerahmeelites speak of wicked things, The Ishmaelites plan impious deeds ; The Ishmaelites curse God, And say, ' Who sees us ? '	6 7

	So Yahwè will shoot at them with an arrow,	8
	Suddenly will their strokes come.	
	Yahwè will bring the Ishmaelites to ruin,	9
	All who behold them will wag the head :	
	And those of Jerahmeel will fear,	10
	Those of Ishmael will discern Yahwè's work ;	
	But the righteous will rejoice in Yahwè,	11
20	And all the upright in heart <sup>1</sup> will triumph,	

*Critical Notes.* 2. מִפֶּחַד אֹיֵב; too vague. Read מַחֲרֵב עֲרֵבִי (cp. xci. 5, Lam. v. 9).—M חָיִי; superfluous. It seems to come from 'ירחמאלים = ירחמאלים, a gloss on פִּעְלֵי אֹן in v. 3 (end).—3. M מְסֹדֵר. Read מִשְׁדֵּר (מִשְׁדֹּר).—4. M רִנְיָתָה. See on ii. 1, lv. 15, and read רִנְיָתָה. Cp. lix. 4. יִרְנֹו, חִי (see on l. 2) also represents this word.—5. M's אֲשֶׁר spoils the style. Like לְשׁוֹנָם (a reference to cruel-speeches is not enough, see vii. 4, 7) it is a fragment of יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים כְּחָרֵב. is surely an editorial alteration of חֲרָבָם (which restore).—6. M חֲצֵם. But דֶּרֶךְ חַיִּי is not Hebrew (lviii. 8 is corrupt). Read קִשְׁתָּם (so G).—M דָּבָר מָר. Read עֲרֵבִים (cp. Gen. xxi. 20).

7. M לִירוֹת בַּמִּשְׁתָּרִים תָּם. Read probably לִישָׁר לִישָׁר. Misarranged letters led to corruption. 'Lying in wait' and 'coverts' naturally go together; 'suddenly do they shoot at him' now comes in more naturally.

9 f. M יַחְקֹוּלָמוֹ (Pasek follows). Read יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. ז and ר, מ and ק confounded.—M דָּבָר רָע. Read דָּבָר רָעוֹת.—Read יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים נִבְלֹת יַחֲשָׁבוּ. יח' underlies יִסְפְּרוּ; יח' underlies יִחְשָׁבוּ. V. 6 in M opens with two dittograms, viz. יַחֲפָשׁוּ. לְמִמּוֹן מִקְשִׁים. (i.e. יַחֲשָׁבוּ נִבְלָת) and תִּמְנִי חֲפֵשׁ מִחֲפֵשׁ (i.e. יַחֲשָׁבוּ נִבְלָת). The readings לָנוּ (S) and תִּמְנִי (MSS) are mere guesses. Cp. the corrupt חֲפֵשׁ in lxxxviii. 6.

11. M קָרַב אִישׁ וְלֵב עָמָק. A Jeremianic commonplace (Jer. xvii. 9) is unexpected. It is possible that it covers over some painfully frank description of Israel's enemies. Remembering 1. the disguises of מְכַחֲשִׁים in Ps. xlix.; 2. what appears the deliberate substitution of בָּרָכָה for נִעְצָר in Job i. 5; 3. the editor's habit of breaking up יִשְׁמַעְאֵל and יִרְחַמָּאֵל, and 4. the many corruptions of אֱלֹהִים in the Psalter, we

<sup>1</sup> All who take refuge in him.

can hardly hesitate to read **נִאָצוּ יִשְׁמְעָאִים יְהוָה (אלהים)**. Nevertheless, the editor has left **נֹאץ** in x. 3, 13, lxxiv. 10, 18 in the sense of 'blaspheming (Yahwè).'

13-18. Point with simple ו (cp. vss., especially S T), and for **הָיוּ** read **יָהִיו** (Gr.).

15. M **וַיִּבְשִׁילֵהוּ עֲגִימוֹ לְשׁוֹנָם**. The sing. suff. is unexpected, and **עֲגִימוֹ** is altogether unintelligible. **עֲלֹמִי**, 'tricks' (Hi.), is imaginary. **עֲמַל** would be too easy and give an imperfect sense. Very probably **הוּ** comes from **יהוה**, and **עֲלִימוֹ** and **לְשׁוֹנָם** are two corrupt forms of **יִשְׁמְעָאִים** (cp. on xxxvi. 3).

17. S and Gr. read **יִרְאוּ**, but **יִירָאוּ** (with simple Waw) is correct. **בְּל־אָדָם**, which follows, can hardly be right; it is superfluous after **כִּלְרָאָה בָם**. What we expect (cp. lix. 14, lxxxiii. 17, 19) is a reference to the effect of the judgment on the surviving enemies. **יִנִּירוּ**, too, is not natural, and Duhm well corrects into **יִפְּרִי**. He keeps the very difficult **הַקְפִּילִי**, but omits **כִּלְרָאָה** as a gloss on v. 9b. This is hardly right. **כִּלְרָאָה** combines two fragments of **יִרְחַמְאִים**, and **הַקְפִּילִי** is a corruption of **יִשְׁמְעָאִים**, which is a correction of the corrupt word read as **וּמַעֲשֵׂהוּ**. Read, therefore,

**יִירָאוּ יִרְחַמְאִים**

**וַיִּפְּרִי פַעֲלִיָּה יִשְׁמְעָאִים**

19. Read **וַיִּשְׂמַח** and ו precedes. Bi., Du. omit **בּוּ** וְחָקָה as a mere amplification. It may, however, represent **בּוּ בְּלַחֲקִי**, a variant to **בְּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל**. Cp. v. 12.

## PSALM LXV.

**PENTAMETERS.** Pious Israel, at the time of the 'end,' gives thanks to Yahwè for its privilege of drawing near to God (cp. v. 8), and for the destruction of its enemies, represented by the Jerahmeelites. So at least according to the revised text. The common view, based on the received text, is different. The mention of the pastures, the flocks, and the corn (vv. 13 f.) is thought to point to the Passover season, and that of Yahwè's subjugation of turbulent elements in the non-Jewish nations (vv. 6, 8 f.), to some recent deliverance of Israel. Parallelisms between Ps. lxv. and Pss. xlv. and lxvi. seem to Del. and Kirkp. to connect the former with the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib. We have seen, however, that Ps. xlv. is no mere 'historical lyric,' but a great eschatological prophecy clothed in poetical form; and such Ps. lxv. and lxvi. should also be. But then, why the abrupt introduction of references to the natural blessings of spring-tide, which are by no means to be expected after the introductory stanzas? A close inspection of the text reveals many points of affinity to passages containing transformations or corruptions of names like 'Jerahmeelites,' &c. Bâ. himself points out that the text of this psalm varied in ancient times (cp. *J. prot. Theol.* '82, pp. 640 f.).

*Deposited. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1

1 To thee let praise be chanted, | O Yahwè ! in Zion ; 2  
To thee let vows be performed | in Jerusalem.

To thy holy place, let men come | with the sound of the 3  
horn,

Let them chant thy mighty deeds | with the sweet notes 4  
of their lyres.

Israel thou didst choose and bring near | to dwell in thy 5  
courts ;

With the boons of thy house we will fill ourselves, | with  
the delicacies of thy temple.

Glorious art thou in righteousness, | O God, who art our 6  
succour,

Who didst deliver us from the Mişrim, | and from those of  
Jerahmeel,—

+A God+ who setteth fast the mountains by his power, | 7  
glorifying himself with prowess,

10 Who stills the booming of ocean, | the tumult of its billows! 8

The Jerahmeelites were afraid of thee, | the inhabitants of 9  
Zarephath,

Mişsur and Rehoboth were amazed at thee, | Arabia and  
the Hagarites.

Thou hast taken heed of the land and restored it, | thou 10  
hast succoured greatly,

The Jerahmeelites are swallowed up, | their pride is cut off.

Broken are the walls of the Arabs, | and their habitations ; 11

Thou hast shattered Rehoboth, thou hast destroyed | the  
dwelling-places of Zarephath. 12

Their palaces are burned with fire, | the castles of Mişsur<sup>1</sup> ; 13

\* \* \* \*

1 f. **In Zion, &c.** For the summons is addressed to the whole people ; 'Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation may enter' (Isa. xxvi. 2). The 'song of praise' and the 'performance of vows' are parallel, as in xxii. 26, l. 14, lxi. 9, cxvi. 17 f.

5. Israel's ideal is involved in the

great fact of its election—it is to 'dwell in Yahwè's courts' (xxiii. 6, xxvii. 4, &c.). 'Paradise Regained' is there ; a heavenly feast is prepared for Israel in the temple (xxxvi. 9 f., lxiii. 6, &c.).

7-10. The psalmist calls to mind the great primeval war of supernatural beings, when the ocean was quelled,

<sup>1</sup> Jerahmeel. Hagarites. Ishmaelites. Mişsur. Amalekites. Zarephathites. Asshurites.

and Rahab(?) was broken in pieces (lxxxix. 9 f., Isa. li. 9 f.; cp. Isa. xvii. 12 f.). Then the great earth-mountain, or, as the later writers said, the mountains, could be planted (cp. Prov. viii. 25). Sea and mountains, as they now exist, are alike proofs of Yahwè's 'prowess,' and not inferior evidence will be his predicted victory over all

hostile powers in the time of the 'end.' Cp. xlvii. 3 f.

11 f. Parallels, xlviii. 5-7, lxxxiii. 6, &c.

14. The pride of the Edomites is specially mentioned (Obad. 3).

15-17. Cp. ix. 7, Am. i. 12. On the list of names in the note, see crit. note.

*Crit. Notes* (cp. Ruben, *Critical Remarks*, '93, p. 23).

1. M **דְּמִיָּה**, a non-existent word (see on xxii. 3). G **πρέπει** (so S), hence Hitz., Ew., Bā., Che. (Ps.<sup>(1)</sup> and *JBL*, xvii. 207), Ruben, We. (doubtfully), Du., read **דְּמִיָּה**, 'is fitting.' Cp. **שָׁוִיָּה**, 'to be suitable' (Esth. iii. 8, and i. 22?). But if the psalmist had meant this, he would have used another word—**נֶאֱוָה** (xxxiii. 1), which indeed Gr. reads here. And what would 'seemly for thee' mean? 'Seemly for thee to offer' (see again xxxiii. 1)?! Read **תְּזַמֵּר**, although the Pual is not found in M. **דְּמִיָּה** would easily be misread **רְמוֹת**.

2. The second hemistich is **בִּירוּשָׁלַם** (so G<sup>ART</sup>, Vg.). **בִּיר** fell out after **דָּר**, and **שָׁלַם** became **שָׁמַע** (v. 2), i.e. **שָׁמַע** (G S J), or **שָׁמַע** (M). Observe too the nearness of **יִשְׁלַם**. Parallelism and metre are now satisfied.

3. M **תַּפְלָה עֵדִיד**, which comes out of **קַמְלָד שְׂדִיד**, i.e. **לְמַקְדָּשִׁיד**. To complete the hemistich transfer **יִבְאוּ**.—M **כָּל-בָּשָׂר**. Some explain (so *OP*, 292; Bertholet, *Stellung*, 191, 220), by comparing the bold universalism of Mal. i. 11; cp. v. 9. But the stress laid in *ll.* 1, 2 on Zion and Jerusalem is adverse to this. Might we then, comparing Joel iii. 1, Isa. lxvi. 23, suppose 'all flesh' to mean only the congregation of Israel together with the proselytes? So Bickell, Duhm. But this is improbable; in P (who is surely strict enough as an Israelite) **כָּל-בָּשָׂר** has no such limitation; it even includes the lower animals (Gen. vi. 12 f., vii. 15 f., ix. 11, 15). In Joel iii. 1 we should probably read **עַל-כָּל-בֵּית־בְּקוּל־שׂוֹפָר יִשְׂרָאֵל**, and in Isa. lxvi. 23, and in our own passage **בְּקוּל־שׂוֹפָר**.

4. M begins, **דְּבָרֵי עֲנוּת**, on which Dathe remarks, 'Vocabulum **דְּבָר** redundat uti sæpe.' Recent scholars, however, find a periphrasis to express manifoldness. Very prosaic and improbable (cp. on xxxv. 20b). G **λόγοι ἀνόμων**. But surely **דְּבָרֵינוּ** comes from **יִזְמְרוּ** (ב and ע both represent מ, ז and ד are phonetically akin). **נְבוֹרֵתִיד נָתַן גְּבָרֵינוּ**.—M **מִנֵּי**. Gr., Du. **מִמֵּנִי** (after G), but this is a mere patch on a faulty text. Read **נְעִימִי** [ב]; cp. on cl. 4. M's **פִּשְׁעֵינוּ**, which follows, is probably due to editorial manipulation of the same word, indistinctly

written (נו = מ). **אתה תכפרם** is evidently a corruption of **פְּנִלְתִּיהֶם**; the parallelism is now perfect. Cp. lxxxi. 3 f., xcvi. 5 f.

5. The want of consecutiveness in *v.* 5 is remarkable. **תבחר** is also the wrong tense. G indeed gives *ὃν ἐξέλεξω καὶ προσελάβου*. This is perhaps arbitrary, G's text being on the whole identical with M's, but it expresses a right feeling. **אשרי** sometimes is a corruption of **ישראל**. It is so here; observe the *Paseḳ*, and note that the mention of Israel corresponds to that of Zion and Jerusalem. Read **יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּחַרְתָּ**. **וַתִּקְרַב לְשֹׁן בַּחֲצֵ**. The continuity of the stanza is now restored.

6. M **קדש**; G **קדש**. T has **קודשא**. But parallelism requires **בְּדִשְׁן** (xxxvi. 9); so Gr.

7. Again a warning *Paseḳ*. **נִזְרָאוֹת | בְּצַדֶּק**, a second accusative to **תַּעֲנִנֵנִי**. But the construction is unexpected, and **בצדק** is ambiguous. And why the imperfect? G *θανυμαστος ἐν δικαιοσύνη*; does this imply simply **נִזְרָא**? At any rate, it does not help us much. But our course is clear, without the versions. Read **נִזְרָא אִתָּהּ בְּצַדֶּקָה**. The **ת** (= ה) in **תַּעֲנִנֵנִי** belongs to **צדק**. **ישענו** has sprung out of **עננו** (written too soon).

8. Again a strange want of consistency in M's text. Duhm remarks, 'Certain as it is that only the Jews can be meant in *v.* 3b and 6a, the poet can believe in some connexion of all mankind with Elohim (cp. Gen. ix. 1 ff.) and in an obscure attraction of the heathen towards the true God (cp. *v.* 9).' It is wonderful that no one has attempted to disintegrate the psalm because of this inconsistency. Nothing important for the sense is won by reading **אֱלֹהִים** (Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We., Du.; cp. T) or **נֹלִים** (Weir; cp. S) for **יִם**. What we require is a definite mention of the past danger. Read **מִפְּלִטְנוּ מִמַּצָּרִים | וִירַחֲמָאֵלִים**. The present text, however, gives us a pleasing idea of the religion of the editor.

9. M **נִאָּזֵר**. Surely unnatural. Read either **נִאָּדָר** (Gr.), cp. Ex. xv. 6, and see on xciii. 1, or **נִהָדָר**.

10. M **מִשְׁבִּיחַ**, 'who stills'? But a **שבח** II., 'to still,' is unproven. In lxxix. 10, for **תשבחם** G perhaps reads **תשקוט** (*καταπραΐνεις*; cp. G, xciv. 13). In Prov. xxix. 11, **שבח** (G strangely *ταμιεύεται*) should be **חשך** (Bi., Frankenb., Toy). Here G has *ὁ συνταράσσων* = **מרגיז** (cp. lxxvii. 17, G). Read rather **משקוט**. Note *Paseḳ*.—M **וְהִמְזֹן לְאֵמִים**. Kön., § 375, finds here the Waw 'adæquationis'; if the text is right, it is rather the Waw of explanation, common in glosses. In fact, 'ל' might be a scribe's explanation of the 'roaring of the ocean,' suggested by Isa. xvii. 12. **לאמים**, however, is one of the possible corruptions of

ירחמאלים (see *Enc. Bib.*, art. 'Leummim'), and a comprehensive study of this passage in its context suggests that 'ירח' is the true reading here (see next note).

11. יִשְׁבִּי קְצוֹת, οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὰ πέριπα. An unexampled expression. מאותתיד; i.e., says Duhm, at the comets, eclipses, tempests, &c.; or, as Ol. and most, at the judicial acts of Yahwè in history. Note, however, the facility of corruption in מאותתיד (see lxxiv. 4, 9). Let us transfer the suffix in this suspicious word to the opening verb, and take in 'ירח' from v. 8 (see last note), and read יִירָאִיד יֶרַח־מְאִילִים | יִשְׁבִּי צָרַפַּת.

12. מִ G מוֹצֵאִי בִקְרָ וְעָרַב. What can this mean? Is it equivalent to מִזְרַח וּמַאֲרָב, 'east and west'? And if so, does it mean the regions of east and west or their inhabitants? These unnatural explanations can hardly be right. Hence König (*Stylistik*, 28) explains 'the outgoings' as = 'those who go forth,' i.e. caravans, which often set out in the evening. M תִּרְנִין; G τέρψεις. Whether the form תִּרְנִין exists is more than doubtful (see on xxxii. 11). König, 'thou makest to exult by the shining forth of sun, moon, and stars.' Gr. conjectures מוֹצֵאִים, with an allusion to the deliverance from Babylon. Applying our historical key, and remembering the tendency of editors to confound עָרַב with עָרַב, we should probably read (cp. xlviii. 6),—

יִתְמָהּ מְצוֹר וְרַחֲבַת | וְעָרַב וְהִגְרִים:

13. M וַתִּשְׁקָקָה, from שִׁקָּה, Joel ii. 24, iv. 13 (Hifil). G prefers וַתִּשְׁבָּקָה; cp. T ואשקיתה (so G Σ J). Rather וַתִּשְׁבָּקָה (lx. 3).—M הַנְּעִשְׂרָנָה, surely not with רַבֶּת? The general sense of the psalm requires הַשְּׁעָרָנָה. G nearly as M.

14. M פִּלֵּג אֱלֹהִים מְלֵא מִים. This ought to mean a metaphorical stream defending Jerusalem, symbolic of the favour of Yahwè (cp. xlv. 5?—Isa. xxxiii. 21). As the context now stands, we can only interpret it of the rain (cp. Job xxxviii. 28?—reading טַל פִּלְגֵּי; בִּפְלֵג; or (Ruben) מִפְּלֵג would, however, be an improvement. But, as Grätz and Ruben have noticed, the context is not free from corruption. In accordance with analogy let us read נִבְלְעוּ יֶרַח־מְאִילִים. מְלֵא, אֱלֹהִים, תְּכִין, דִּגְנָם are all regular corruptions of 'ירח'.—M פִּיכֵן תְּכִינָה. Even if the blessings of agriculture are referred to, דִּגְנָם is unexpected. Ruben מְזוֹנָה; G τὸ τροφὴν αὐτῶν. Cp. G, 2 Chr. xi. 23. Read נִכְרַת נֶאֱמַן. כִּיכֵן ת' is dittographic.



15. M תִּלְמִיךָ רִיָּה. An editorial adaptation of a miswritten correction ירחמאלים (see *l.* 14). The inff. absol. רִיָּה and נִחַת are unexpected. That נִחַת in the sense of 'washing down' is very strained, is pointed out by Hupfeld. Does such a Piel exist? See on xviii. 35.—M נִחַתוּ נְדִידָה, to which we must add בְּרִבְיָבִים. Read נִחַתוּ נְדִידוֹת עֲרִבִים (cp. on רִבְיָבִים, lxxii. 6).—M תִּמְוִנָנָה, but G ἐνφρανθήσεται. Read probably וּמִשְׁכּוֹתֵיהֶם.

16. M צִמְחָהּ, תִּבְרָךְ. Read מִחְצֶת רַחֲבָת.—M עֲטֶרֶת שֵׁנֶת. מוֹבְתָד. An unexampled expression. If the ordinary view of the psalm be retained, we might read with Gr., עֲשֶׂרֶת, and with Herz תִּבְוֹאָתָד; we might perhaps omit שֶׁרֶת (so read for שֵׁנֶת) as a ditto-gram. But there is a better remedy for the faults of the text. Read אֲבֹדֶת מִשְׁכָּנֹת צֶרֶפֶת.

17. M וּמַעֲנִלֶיךָ יִרְעִפוּ דָּשָׁן. The expression 'the paths of Yahwè' has been much admired. But it is strange that the figure should be so obscurely expressed. וּפִלְגֶיךָ would be more natural (cp. *l.* 11, and Job xxix. 6). But the passage has been editorially manipulated. Read probably הִיכָלֵיהֶם נִשְׂרָפוּ בְּאֵשׁ.

18. אֲרָמְנוֹת מְצִיר נֶאֱוֹת מְדָבָר יִרְעִפוּ. The rest of the stanza (and psalm?) is lost. What follows appears to be the composition of the editor, based on a string of names, ירחמאל, ישמעאלים, הגרים, &c. (as above), appended by a learned scribe in illustration of the circumstances referred to in the psalm. One is sorry to lose almost the only passage in which laughter is used as 'the symbol of innocent, refreshing hilarity of spirit' (cp. *Spectator*, Jan. 19, 1889).

## PSALM LXVI.—I.

**TRIMETERS.** Certainly a 'new' or Messianic psalm, though 'Yahwè reigns' does not occur in the extant portion of our psalm. The title in G has been thought to imply that *v.* 9a was explained of the resurrection of the nation. This, however, is most unlikely. Any one could have seen that the image presented was not that of a dead body raised to life, but that of a living organism supernaturally protected amidst crushing pain and ordeals of fire and flood. Literally speaking, the painful purifying process is not yet ended, but faith supports itself by imagining the happy goal to have been reached. The poem is not original. Literary reminiscences or commonplaces abound. Cp. *v.* 1 with xcvi. 1, xcvi. 4; *v.* 7b with xi. 4, Prov. xv. 3, also Ps. lxxiii. 7, 19; *v.* 10 with Isa. xlviii. 10, Jer. ix. 7, Zech. xiii. 9, Mal. iii. 3 (see also notes). The Arabians, Ishmaelites, &c., are mentioned as representatives of Israel's foes. It is a part of the psalmists' eschatology that the survivors of the conquered nations will be won over to a sincere obedience to Yahwè.

Lxvi.<sup>(2)</sup> is also in trimeters. It may have been written as an appendix to lxvi.<sup>(1)</sup>, after the original close of that psalm had been lost, or if this closing portion was omitted by design, as a substitute for it. In the stress which it lays

upon sacrifices it reminds us of the brief appendix to Ps. li. (*vv.* 20 f.), which, by the way, may also very well be a substitute for the original close of that psalm. This will account for the absence of any description of the past affliction of the speaker. And who is the speaker? Surely not an individual; surely this is not a liturgical form for the special use of any pious Israelite who had vowed a sacrifice and came to the temple to fulfil his vow (Jacob, *ZAW*, xvii. [97], 68). That even Duhm should hold this improbable view, is strange. What individual could offer the large sacrifices described in *v.* 15? 'Probably the formula was variable,' says Duhm. This is altogether against sound criticism. The psalm fragment may indeed have been appropriated by individuals; and the bare possibility exists that individuals dealt freely with lines 5-9, omitting or altering (?) them. But it can only have been written for a Person capable of offering all the sacrifices here described, and that Person is the community of temple-worshippers (cp. Isa. i. 11). The passage is exactly parallel to xxii. 23-27, except that it is doubtful there whether the feast spoken of is partly material or wholly spiritual; also to Ps. cxvi. Certainly the persons addressed in the second stanza (seen in its emended form) are not merely the worshippers who had come to the temple to partake of a private sacrificial feast, but pious Jews everywhere; as in xxxiv. 12, the psalmist thinks of the wider audience reached by the written word. That 'my soul' can be said by the personified community is proved by Isa. xxvi. 9; Jer. iv. 31; Lam. i. 16; we need not therefore assume, with Beer, that the psalmist in *v.* 16 distinguishes himself from the community.

Nor is it only on sacrifices that the psalmist lays stress; how indeed could this be? He is not, like the author of Ps. l., of the school of Jeremiah, but he regards sacrifices, not as mere forms, but as symbolic of obedience. 'Under the lips' of the speaker there is 'no guile' (cp. Isa. liii. 9b). To obey the law of sacrifice and not the law of civil justice would be inconsistent with such a statement. In no single respect has the speaker been 'disloyal' to Yahwè's *bē'rit*. Had it been otherwise, God would have searched this out and punished it. But so far from this being the case, he has heard Israel's prayer; he has made good his plighted word (*ll.* 17 f.). Cp. Ps. xlv. 17-21.

## LXVI.—I.

*Deposited Marked: A song of praise.*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    |  | 1 |
| 1  | [Sing unto Yahwè a new song,]              |   |
|    | Shout unto Yahwè, all ye upon earth.       |   |
|    | Chant hymns to his glory, O ye of Ishmael; | 2 |
|    | Chant hymns, O ye of Jerahmeel.            |   |
|    | Say, Greatly hast thou exalted thyself!    | 3 |
|    | All thy foes do homage unto thee;          |   |
|    | The Arabians seek thee eagerly,            | 4 |
|    | The Ishmaelites chant hymns unto thee.     |   |
|    | Come ye and see his wonders—               | 5 |
| 10 | +How+ terribly he dealt with the traitors! |   |
|    | The Ishmaelites and Hagarites were routed, | 6 |
|    | The Arabians and the Jerahmeelites.        |   |
|    | He rules the peoples by his might;         | 7 |
|    | His eyes keep watch over the nations;      |   |
|    | Let the sufferers rejoice in him,          |   |
|    | Let the upright chant hymns unto God.      |   |

- Bless ye our God, O ye suffering ones, 8  
 Make the sound of his praise to be heard,  
 Who has kept our soul in life, 9  
 20 And has not suffered our feet to tremble.
- For thou, O God, hast proved us, 10  
 Thou hast smelted us as they smelt silver ;  
 Thou broughtest us into the abyss, 11  
 Thou didst put us in the depths of water ;
- Thou didst lift up the head of our haters, 12  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 Through fire and through water did we pass,  
 But thou broughtest us into an ample space.

## LXVI.—2.

- 1 I will enter thy house with burnt offerings, 13  
 I will pay unto thee my vows,  
 Those which came forth from my lips, 14  
 And my mouth uttered, when I was in straits.  
 Burnt offerings of fatlings will I bring up to thee, 15  
 With [fat] of the kidneys of rams ;  
 I will place bullocks [upon thine altar],  
 I will bring up lambs [and] he-goats.
- Come, hearken, let me recount 16  
 10 What he has done for myself.  
 If I had cried unto him with my mouth, 17  
 When under my lips was guile,  
 If in my heart had been no honesty, 18  
 The Lord would not have hearkened [to my voice] ;  
 But God has hearkened, 19  
 He has listened to the voice of my prayer.
- Blessed be God, who has not withdrawn 20  
 18 His pledge of loving-kindness and faithfulness !

7 f. Similar sympathetic language is found elsewhere (see on xviii. 45).

9. Cp. xlv. 9.—10. *With the traitors*. See on ix. 6.—14. *Keep watch*; cp. Prov. xv. 3. Retribution, though delayed, is certain; hence the summons to rejoice in *ll.* 15 f.—19 f. Cp. cxvi. 2.

21 f. **Hast proved us**, &c. Cp. xii. 7, xvii. 3, xxvi. 2.—23 f. Cp. lxix. 3.

27 f. **Fire** and **water** are images for the extremes of peril; cp. Isa. xliii. 2. So *an ample space* means freedom and ease (xviii. 20).

*Critical Notes.* Title. G ἀναστάσις = תְּחִיָּה, perhaps a corruption of תְּהִלָּה; cp. l. 18.

1 ff. Insert שִׁירֵי לַיהוָה שִׁיר חָדָשׁ (xcvi. 1); parallelism requires this. Here and elsewhere we must read יְהוָה for אֱלֹהִים. — For כְּבוֹד־שְׁמוֹ, as in xxix. 2a, read יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים. Cp. on l. 8.

4. M שִׁימוֹ, an error caused by the preceding שְׁמוֹ; but cp. also lxviii. 5. M's reading cannot be defended by Josh. vii. 19, Isa. xlii. 12, where לַיהוָה follows. Read, not שִׁירֵי (Gr., Du.), nor שִׁיחוֹי (Perles), but זְמִירוֹ (S); ז became ש, ר became י. — M כְּבוֹד תְּהִלָּתוֹ. Clearly something is amiss. Gr., We., Du. point כְּבוֹד. But 'the glory of his praise' is tautological. כְּבֹד represents one of the current distortions of רַחֲמָאֵל [ים]; תְּהִלָּתוֹ, too, probably represents רַחֲמָאֵל.

5. M מִה־נִּזְרָא; G ὡς φερέα (plur.; a guess). Read (for לֵאלֹהִים מִה־נִּזְרָא) מְאֹד נִעְלִית (cp. xlvii. 10).

6. M G מַעֲשֵׂיךָ בְּרַב עֲנֶה. Clearly wrong. Read שִׁתְּחוּ לְךָ צָרִיךְ. (transferred from v. 4, corr. text, where it was dittographed; note Pasek).

7. M יִכְחֲשׁוּ. Read יִשְׁחָרוּ (see on xviii. 45). — M אֵיבִיךָ. Read עֲרִבִים (one of the regular corruptions or alterations).

8 f. M's יִזְמְרוּ שְׁמֶךָ סֵלָה comes from a dittographed יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים. — M מִפְּעֻלֹת אֱלֹהִים. Read נִפְלְאוֹתָיו.

10. M עַל־בְּנֵי אָדָם. There are perhaps some passages which favour the view that the Jews more and more regarded themselves as the true human kind, all else having become corrupt. But it would be neither in accordance with M's representation of the context nor with that given in our text to include this passage among them. Read עַל־בְּנָדִים (cp. lviii. 2).

11 f. M הִפְךָ יָם לִיבְשָׁה; so G. But, in accordance with xlv. 9, we expect a reference to something of contemporary interest, and Pasek warns us to distrust the text. יָם לִיבְשָׁה conceals one tribal name, and בְּנֵהר (M G) another. Read הִפְכוּ יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים וְהַגְדִּים. — M יַעֲבְרוּ בְּרִגְלָם. Read עֲרִבִים וִירַחֲמָאֵלִים. 'עֲרִבִים' has two beats. — On close of v. 6 see next note.

13. M עוֹלָם; note preceding Pasek. G ἐν τῇ δυναστείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ. עוֹלָם never means 'the world' in Biblical Hebrew (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Eternal'), nor could the ideas of eternity and omniscience be combined in the same line. Read לְאָמִים.

15. M שם נשמחה בו (supported by G), at end of v. 6, as if referring to the crossing of the river, &c. Bā. explains שם, 'on the occurrence of such events,' and regards the drying up of the sea and the crossing of the river on foot as symbolical expressions for frequently occurring manifestations of God's care for Israel. Duhm connects the words with משל ונו' in the next verse, and alters שם into שמה (inf. abs.), but 'heals' the 'hurt' of the text too 'lightly.' Surely the passage is the missing line of the next quatrain, and should run עניים ישמחו בו (the נ in נשמחה comes from

16. M אל־ירמו למו סלה, הַסֹּרְרִים, which Duhm renders, 'rebels cannot lift themselves up' (*i.e.* triumph); the ה in 'הס' is, of course, dittographed. The only modern scholar who has questioned סוררים is Street (1790). Both here and in lxviii. 7, 19 he gives ס the sense of 'exiles,' comparing סורה, Isa. xlix. 21, which, however is non-existent (see *SBOT, Isa.*, Heb., 145). Certainly 'rebels' is unsuitable to the context both here and in Ps. lxviii. ירמו למו (רמו) is also very improbable; where is the object? Note the warning Pasek. Read יִשְׂרָאֵל יִזְמְרוּ אֱלֹהִים. אל, למו, and סלה are all fragments (ס comes from ס) of אֱלֹהִים.

17. M עמים; unsuitable. Note Pasek, and read .

19 f. M השם; obscure. Read השמר (Gr.).—Read למוט (Hi., Du.); but cp. Kön., *Synt.*, § 200c.

23. M בַּמְצֹדָה; obscure. Read, not בַּמְצֹדָה (Gr.; Σ πολιορκία), but בַּמְצֹלָה (lxviii. 23, lxix. 3).—M שְׁמַת מוֹעֶקָה בְּמַתְיָנו. Herz suggests מְצֹקָה (cp. G S); but we should have expected חִלְחָלָה or צִירִים (Isa. xxi. 2, Nah. ii. 11). Read almost certainly בְּמַעֲמָקֵי שְׁמַתֵּנוּ. See exeg. note.

25. M הִרְפַּבְתָּ אֲנוֹשׁ לְרֹאשֵׁנוּ. G ἐπεβίβασας; J imposuisti. The sense is not clear, nor is Isa. li. 23 phraseologically parallel. Read הִרְמוֹת רֹאשׁ לְשִׁנָּאֵנוּ (cp. lxxxix. 43a). The parallel line has dropped out.

28. M לְרוּיָה. G (εἰς ἀναψυχήν) and all the vss. presuppose לְרוּחָה (cp. xviii. 20). See Bā., *J. Prot. Th.*, '82, p. 641. So most moderns.

lxvi.<sup>(2)</sup> 3. M אֲשֶׁר פָּצוּ שְׁפָתַי. Is שְׁפָתַי the subject or the object? At any rate, פָּצָה is an unsuitable word, for it implies *inconsiderate* speech (Judg. xi. 35 f., Job xxxv. 16). Read, of course, יִצְאוּ מִשְׁפָּתַי (cp. Judg. xi. 36).

5 ff. M מִיָּחִים. A non-existent word. Read מְרִיאִים (see *SBOT*,<sup>6</sup> Heb. on Isa. v. 17 [Engl. ed. p. 83]).—Insert חֶלֶב, and for קִטְרֶת read certainly כְּלִיֹּת (Isa. xxxiv. 6).—M אֶעֱשֶׂה. The context suggests אֶשָּׂא (Herz); cp. xcvi. 8. Insert עַל־מִזְבֵּחַךְ; cp. Isa. lx. 7.—M עַם־עֲתוּדִים סֵלָה. Read כְּבָרִים וְעֲתוּדִים אֶעֱלֶה; cp. again Isa. xxxiv. 6, and Ps. lxix. 32 (corr. text). סֵלָה, as so often, replaces a word of the original text. ע and ס are often confounded.

11 f. M אֱלֹהֵי פִירְקָרָאִתִּי וְרוֹמֶם תַּחַת לְשׁוֹנֵי [אִם] אֱלֹהֵי. Read אֱלֹהֵי וּמִרְמָה ת' ל' אֶן. (Herz, אֶן, taking over אֶן [אִין] from next verse. See also Ruben, *Crit. Remarks*, 18).

13 f. M אֶן אִם־רָאִיתִי בְּלִבִּי. A most improbable use of רָאָה. Read אִם אֶן יִשָּׁר בְּלִבִּי.—Insert קוֹלִי (Bi.); metre.

17 f. Omit אֲשֶׁר.—M תַּפְלִיתִי. Read, not תַּחֲנִנִי (Du.), but בְּרִית. The corruption is analogous to that of קִטְרֶת from כְּלִיֹּת.—M וַחֲסִדוֹ מֵאֲתִי. Read חֲסִדוֹ וְאֲמָתוֹ. A self-evident but quite overlooked correction.

## PSALM LXVII.

**T**RIMETERS. An anticipation of the full sovereignty of Yahwè. The psalm consists of three strophes; (2) and (3) have an initial refrain. In *ll.* 1-3 there is an echo of part of the high-priestly blessing (Num. vi. 24 f.).

*Dèposited. For the Ishmaelites. Marked.*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    |  | 1 |
| 1  | Let [Yahwè] our God have pity upon us,               | 2 |
|    | Let him bless us and have compassion upon us,        |   |
|    | Let him make his face to shine upon us,              |   |
|    | That thy way may be known upon earth,                | 3 |
|    | Thy deliverance among all nations !                  |   |
|    | Let the peoples give thanks to thee, O Yahwè !       | 4 |
|    | Let the peoples, all of them, give thanks to thee,   |   |
|    | Let the nations rejoice with loud acclaim,           | 5 |
|    | For thou wilt rule the peoples justly,               |   |
| 10 | And lead them in the right paths.                    |   |
|    | Let the peoples give thanks unto thee, O Yahwè !     | 6 |
|    | Let the peoples, all of them, give thanks unto thee, |   |
|    | [For] righteously thou wilt judge the world.         |   |
|    | Let Yahwè our God bless us,                          |   |
|    | And let all the ends of the earth revere him !       |   |

I f. Read **יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ** (*l.* 14).—Insert **וִירַחֲמֵנוּ**; G (Nc.a.R a.)  
 kai

10. M **בְּאֶרֶץ, וְלְאָמִים**. Parallelism is wanting. **בְּאֶרֶץ** is otiose; the suffix in **תִּנְהַם** is unnecessary. Note Pasek, and read **צֶדֶק בְּמִעֲנֵי** (xxiii. 3). **אֶרֶץ** and **צֶדֶק** are liable to confusion (like **חֹזֶק** and **צֶדֶק**).

13 f. M **אֶרֶץ נְתַנְהִיבֹלָה**. Miserably poor. It is usual to compare lxxv. 13<sup>b</sup>, but (1) *v.* 13<sup>a</sup> prepares for *b*, and (2) *v.* 13 is an interpolation. The text is corrupt. Read **פִּי־צֶדֶק תִּדְרִין תִּבְלֵל** (xcvi. 13, xcvi. 9).—Omit second **יִבְרַכְנוּ אֱלֹהִים** (dittogram).

## PSALM LXVIII.

PSALMS lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> and lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup> are in different metres, the one consisting of trimeters, the other of tetrameters. Both, however, are composed of pentads, and from the many points of affinity between the two poems we may assume that the second was written as a supplement to the first. The main idea of both poems is the near termination of Israel's misery and the reestablishment of the divine kingdom on Mount Zion. It is the retrospect in lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> which is referred to when the second poet speaks of the 'recounting of all Yahwè's wonders' and the praising of Yahwè as the 'Marshal of Israel' (*ll.* 11–20). The 'wonders' are the progress of Yahwè at the head of his people from Edom to Mount Zion, which is regarded as a type of the restoration of the Jewish exiles from captivity in Edom, and of Yahwè's second and definitive occupation of the holy mount of Zion (cp. xxiv. 7–10). Special use is made of the song in Judg. v., whose reputed author (Deborah) is apparently referred to as a 'prophetess.'

With regard to the date of Ps. lxviii. (or rather, one ought to say, of lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>) it has been thought that the mention of 'Bashan' in *v.* 23, of the four tribes which correspond to the two provinces of the Palestinian Jewry in *v.* 28, of the 'beast of the reeds' and of the 'quarrelsome peoples' in *v.* 31 point to some part of the Greek period, viz. either the period of the havoc wrought in Palestine by the first Ptolemy (B.C. 320?) or one of the later periods (between 220 and 217 or between 203 and 198 B.C.) when the prospect of the downfall of Ptolemaean rule may have excited Messianic expectations (see *OP*, 192). Wellh. (*Skizzen*, vi. 177) and Smend (*Rel.-gesch.*<sup>(2)</sup>, 265, 368) even think of the age of Judah the Maccabee (cp. 1 Macc. v.), while Duhm regards our psalm as a celebration of the enterprizes of Alexander Jannæus (B.C. 104–78). According to the traditional text the two first-mentioned views appear to be the most tenable. W. K. Smith, however, thought it safer not to rely on these supposed historical indications, and inclined (doubtfully) to refer Ps. lxviii. to the time of the overthrow of the Persian empire (*OTJC*<sup>(2)</sup>, 440). All that we can say is that the Jerahmeelite or Edomite oppression was not yet over, that the temple was rebuilt, and that pious temple-worshippers were looking out for a speedy divine interposition to complete what was lacking in Israel's deliverance. Among the phraseological parallelisms in lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, observe especially *v.* 23 and Zech. x. 10, Isa. xxvii. 13; *v.* 24 and Isa. lxiii. 1, 3, 6; *vv.* 29, 31 and passages in Pss. xxii. and xlii.–xliii., and of course note the connexion between Part ii. and Judg. v.

Dr. J. P. Peters, who has already recognized the composite character of the psalm, assumes a considerable interval between the component parts of the work (*New World*, ii. [96], p. 301). There is, from our point of view, no valid reason for such a theory. The imitative style of Ps. lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup>, and its view of Israel as God's poor (note the phrase 'the orphans,' *ll.* 11, 30 ff.) exclude a pre-exilic date, while Ps. lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, which presupposes lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup>, has late characteristics of its own in abundance.

## LITERATURE (A SELECTION).

- Ed. Reuss, *Der 68 Ps., ein Denkmal exegetischer Noth u. Kunst* ('51).  
 Ch. Bruston, *Un chant de guerre du temps de Josué* ('66).  
 J. P. N. Land, 'Drie Psalmen verklaard,' *Theol. Tijdschr.*, '72, 540 ff.  
 J. Grill, 'Der achtundsechzigste Psalm' ('83).  
 J. Halévy, 'Le Ps. lxviii.,' *Rev. des études juives*, xix. ('89), 1-16.  
 A. Hilgenfeld, 'Die Schlacht bei Issos im A. T.,' *Zt. f. wiss. Th.* xxx. ('86), 91 ff.  
 J. W. Pont, *Ps. lxviii. Eine exegetisch-kritische Studie* ('87).  
 Isid. Loeb, *La Littérature des Pauvres* ('92), 69, n. 5.  
 M. Noordtzij, *De 68ste en de 16de psalm vertaald en verklaard* (1900).

## LXVIII.—I.

*Deposited. Of 'Arab-Ethan. Marked.* 1

## Part I.

- 1 Yahwè arises, his enemies scatter, 2  
 Before him his haters flee,  
 Like smoke which [the wind] dispels; 3  
 As wax melts before the fire,  
 +So+ perish the wicked before Yahwè;  
 But let the righteous rejoice, exult, 4  
 Before Yahwè let them triumph in +their+ joy:  
 Sing unto Yahwè, chant unto him, 5  
 Praise him who rides upon the clouds,  
 10 Glorify Yahwè, exult before him.  
 A father of the orphans and the sojourners 6  
 Is God in his holy habitation;  
 Yahwè makes the outcasts his house-mates, 7  
 He brings forth the prisoners according to his righteousness;  
 Surely the upright shall dwell in his courts.

## Part II.

- <sup>1</sup>When thou wentest forth before thy people, 8  
 When thou marchedst from the highlands of Aram,  
 The earth quaked, the heavens swayed to and fro,<sup>2</sup> 9  
 [The clouds also dropped water,]  
 20 At thy presence, O God of Israel.  
 With the treasures of heaven [above] 10  
 Thou didst bless thine inheritance, O Yahwè,  
 And all that it contained thou madest ready:  
 With thy corn they were satisfied therein, 11  
 In thy goodness thou didst prepare for the people.

<sup>1</sup> O Yahwè.<sup>2</sup> At the presence of God, this ~~Snai~~.



- Yahwè gave a prophetess 12  
 Who brought glad tidings of great booty :  
 'Kings of armies [have fled,] 13  
 The Lord [has succoured] his beloved ones ;  
 30 His dove shall divide the spoil.
- ' Though she dwells among the ashmounds, 14  
 Her wings will he overlay with silver,  
 And her pinions with gold ;  
 In the pavilion of the kings shalt thou sit, 15  
 [O folk of Naphtali] and Zebulon.'
- O mountain of Jerahmeel, mountain of Cushan, 16  
 O mountain of Gebalon, mountain of Cushan,  
 Wherefore skippest thou, O mountain of Gebalon, 17  
 Because of the mount wherein Yahwè would fain dwell,  
 40 Yea, wherein Yahwè will for ever abide ?
- The league of the Jerahmeelites thou hast scattered, 18  
 The clans of Cushan at Kadesh ;  
 Thou hast gone up to the height of the Jebusite, 19  
 Hast allotted the castles of Jerahmeel ;  
 Surely +there+ the upright shall abide.

## LXVIII.—2.

- 1 Blessed be Yahwè, +even+ God, our redeemer, 20  
 Yahwè hath delivered us, the God who is our succour, 21  
 It is he who gives great might to his people ;  
 Surely, God shatters the prince of the Arabians, 22  
 Yea, the leader of Seir who rages in his guilt.
- The Lord said, From Cushan I will restore [thee], 23  
 I will restore [thy sons] from Missur and Teman,  
 That thou mayest trample on the palaces of Aram ; 24  
 10 That thou mayest tread with thy feet on the castles of the  
 Arabians.
- \* \* \* \* \*
- They recount all thy wonders, O Yahwè, 25  
 They praise thee, O my God, O my king, in the sanctuary !  
 Princes go before, minstrels follow,  
 In the midst of damsels playing on timbrels and dancing.
- \* \* \* \* \*

- Within his temple they bless God, 27  
 They extol Yahwè, the Marshal of Israel,  
 The princes of little Benjamin, +God's+ beloved ones, 28  
 The princes of great Judah, the blameless ones,  
 20 The princes of Zebulon, the princes of Naphtali.  
 Give charge, O Yahwè, to thy faithfulness and thy loving-  
 kindness, 29  
 Let them, O God, preserve that which thou hast wrought  
 for us.  
 Do thou quell the wild beasts of pointed horns, 31  
 The troop of wild oxen, the mighty lions,  
 Do thou scatter the peoples that delight to quarrel.  
 Let all the Ishmaelites kneel to thee, 30  
 Let the Jerahmeelites bring thee tribute,  
 Let the Zarephathites do homage with store of silver, 31b, 32  
 Let Cushites and Miṣrites make offerings of gold,  
 30 \* \* \* \* \*  
 O ye kingdoms of the earth, sing ye unto God, 33  
 [Praise Yahwè !] chant hymns unto Yahwè !  
 Praise him who rides on the heights of the skies, 34  
 [Glorify Yahwè, exult before him],  
 When he utters his voice, lo, the earth is in pain.  
 Ascribe prevailing might to Israel's God, 35  
 Whose majesty and prevailing might reach the skies.  
 Majestic is Yahwè in his holy dwelling, 36  
 It is he who gives great might to his people,  
 40 Blessed be Yahwè, the Redeemer of Israel.

1 f. Alluding to Num. x. 35.—4. Cp. Mic. i. 4.—5. *The wicked*; see on ix. 5, lviii. 11.—9. *Rides upon the clouds*. Cp. xviii. 11, civ. 3, Isa. xix. 1.—11, 13, 14. A series of figurative terms for Israel. *Orphans and so-journers*; cp. x. 14, xciv. 6. *Prisoners*; as lxix. 34, lxxix. 11, cii. 21, cvii. 10. Cp. also cxlvii. 2, 'outcasts of Israel.'

16-20. Imitating Judg. v. 4 f. Yahwè leads forth his people from Sinai, which is to be placed in the neighbourhood of Kadesh, in the highlands of Jerahmeel (cp. II. 36 f.). In Judg. v. 4 it is probably best to read מִמִּצְרַיִם, 'from Miṣṣur,' and מִשְׁרָה אֲרָם, 'from the highland of Aram

(Jerahmeel).' See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Field,' 'Moses,' 'Sinai.' See Moore on Judg. v. 4. He denies that v. 4 can refer to Mt. Sinai or Horeb, Horeb. at an rate, being in the land of Midian.

21. Cp. Dt. xxxiii. 13. The 'treasures of heaven' are rain and dew.

26 ff. Here begins a scene from the early warfare of Israel. The restoration is only probable. The *prophetess* is Deborah. The *glad tidings* are those of the victory described in Judg. v. *His dove*—not the 'mother of Sisera'—*shall divide the spoil*. According to MT, תַּחֲלֵק, being || to יִדְדוֹן, must refer to the

past. This, however, does not suit **מְבַשֶּׁרֶת**. Duhm, therefore, makes v. 13 historical. But 'the great host of **מְבַשֶּׁרֶת**' (so MT, Du., &c.) seems rather neglected by him, and the address which he supposes to **אֲדֹנָי** ('O Lord') is unexpected. *His dove*; a term of endearment (Cant. ii. 14), adopted by later writers for Israel (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Jonah, Book of,' § 3<sup>(1)</sup>); C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Essays*, 45.

31. **The ashmounds.** The *mazbala* is meant—the place outside the Arab villages where the dung and other rubbish is thrown. Cp. Wetzstein in Del.'s *Job* (Germ. ed., 62). Cp. cxiii. 7.—32 f. The *overlaying* of the dove's wings with silver and gold may be illustrated by 2 S. ii. 24, 'ye daughters of Israel, weep for Saul . . . who decked your raiment with gold.'

34 f. **Pavilion** (Jer. xliii. 10); on **שְׂפָרִיר** see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Pavilion.'—*Naphtali and Zebulun*; cp. Judg. v. 18.

36 f. **The mountain of Jerahmeel, of Cushan, of Gebalon,** are most probably alternative designations for the sacred mountain of Sinai or Horeb. The idea of the later Jews apparently was that Yahwè transferred his abode from Horeb (refusing to dwell any longer beside those who injured and oppressed his people) to Zion. This makes a good connexion with the next stanza. The confusion between 'Lebanon,' the great northern mountain-ranges, and 'Gebalon,' the mountain-ranges of Jerahmeel and Edom, seems to have obscured the meaning of several passages in the O.T. Hiram, for instance, is represented as having a free hand in Lebanon; but 'Hiram' is a corruption of 'Jerahmeel,' and 'Tyre' (**צֹר**) of **מִצְרַיִם** (Misur). This king was lord of the Negeb, and had command of the mountains of the far south of Palestine, not of Lebanon. But see also on xxix. 5 f.

41 f. **The league of the Jerahmeelites and the clans of Cushan** are the enemies who were conquered, according to the original form of the tradition in Judg. iv., at the southern Kadesh (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Sisera').

43 ff. Cp. xxiv. 7, 9, 'ye portals of Jerahmeel.' The original population

of Jerusalem was represented as Jerahmeelite (on text of 2 S. v. 6, 8, see *Crit. Bib.*); Isaiah, in xxix. 1 f., 7, probably called Jerusalem, not 'Ariel,' but 'Jerahmeel' (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Loruhamah'). The ascent of Yahwè to the 'height' refers to the transference of the ark to the city of David (2 S. vi.). The *height*, **מָרוֹם**, i.e. Zion, as Jer. xxxi. 12, Ezek. xvii. 23, xx. 40. See crit. note.—**שָׁכֵן** used absolutely, as cii. 29; cp. l. 40.

lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup> 4 f. Cp. cx. 5 f. No hint of any change in the usual political horizon of the psalmists.—6 ff. *The Lord said.* Alluding to Zech. x. 10, which appears originally to have run, 'and I bring them out of the land of Mizrim, and out of Asshur (Geshur) will I gather them'; Isa. xxvii. 13, 'and they shall come who were lost in the land of Asshur (Geshur), and who were outcasts in the land of Mizrim.'—9. *Castles.* Cp. ix. 7 (note); xlix. 12.

11. **Wonders** usually means Yahwè's great deeds in history (e.g. xl. 6, lxxviii. 4, 11, cvii. 8, 15, &c.). In ix. 2, however, the (anticipated) overthrow of Israel's hated foes, the Jerahmeelites, is included among the 'wonders' for which the psalmist gives thanks. It may be so here, still it is a sufficient explanation to suppose a reference to such great events in the remote past as are described in lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup>

13 ff. A procession is described. First come the tribal chiefs; in the next stanza those of Benjamin, Judah, Zebulun, and Naphtali are mentioned—the two latter simply in order to connect the present with the past, Naphtali and Zebulun having been foremost in the ancient battle referred to in lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> (l. 35). Next come the minstrels, surrounded by damsels who play the part of Miriam and her companions; cp. Ex. xv. 20, 'with timbrels and with dances.'

17. **The Marshal of Israel.** Cp. Isa. xxxiii. 22 (Ps. lxxxi. 5).—18, 19. *Beloved ones*, cp. Dt. xxxiii. 12.—*Blameless ones*, i.e. faithful to God's law (cxix. 1).

21. **Give charge to**, &c., alluding to xlii. 9 (and || passages); cp. xliv. 5, cxxxiii. 3.

23 f. **Wild beasts of pointed horns**, &c., alluding to xxii. 11, 26,

37 f.; xxxv. 11. 22 ff. In all these passages the fierce Jerahmeelites or Edomites are referred to. Indeed, **יִרְחֲמְאֵלִים** suggests **יִרְחֲמִים**.

25. **That delight to quarrel.** It is not the Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ who are referred to, but the N. Arabian populations — 'men of strife' (xxxv. 19); cp. cxx. 7.—26-29.

Cp. lxxii. 9 f., lxxvi. 19-22, and see crit. note.

31 ff. Full of this happy prospect, the poet calls upon all nations to join him in a song of praise.—*On the heights of the skies.* Cp. lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup>, l. 9, Dt. xxxiii. 26, Isa. xiv. 14.

38. **Majestic**; **נִוְרָא** in such a context is more than 'terrible' (lxvi. 3, 5; Ex. xv. 11).

*Critical Notes.* 1. Read **יָקֻם**. So G (Vg. J). Hence the Wycliffite version, 'God rise up, and his enemies be scattered; and they that hate him flee from his face. As smoke faileth, fail they; as wax fleeteth from the face of fire, so perish sinners from the face of God.' Cp. the opening of lxvii. The sense is far finer thus. **יָקֻם**, 'will arise,' is cold by comparison.

3. M **בְּהִנְדָּף**, i.e. the choice is left open between **בְּהִנְדָּף** and **בְּנִדָּף** (Kön. ii. 554). **תִּנְדָּף** is more difficult. J. W. Pont corrects it into **מִפְּנֵי רוּחַ**; so after him We. Just possible, but not probable. Beyond doubt **תִּנְדָּף** comes from **תִּדְפֹּנוּ**; **הִנְדָּף** is a dittogram. Read **[תִּדְפֹּנוּ]**.

1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 16, 20, &c., restore **יְהוָה** for **אֱלֹהִים**, or, sometimes, for metre's sake, **יְה**.—7. Read **יִשְׁשׁוּ** (without ו); cp. G.—8. Read ו; M's **שְׁמוֹ** is a corrupt dittogram of **זְמִירוֹ**; cp. on lxvi. 2.

9 f. For **סִלּוֹ לְרִכֵּב** read **הִלָּלוּ רִכֵּב** (cp. on lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, l. 33). **יָ** ('cast up a way') is unsuitable (see S T). **ב** is dittographed. For **עֲרִבּוֹת** read probably **עֲלֵעֲבוֹת**. For **בֵּיתָ שְׁמוֹ** read **יָהּ שְׁבָחוּ יָהּ** (**יָהּ** absorbed). Krochmal corrects **ש' ב'** into **הַשְּׁמִים** (following T's interpretation of **עֲרִבּוֹת**); Abbott into **בִּישְׁכֵּן** (a gloss). Gr. reads **בָּרְכוּ שְׁמוֹ**. Bp. Hare, and long after him Reifmann, Dy., Hilgenf. read **בֵּיתָ שְׁמָחוּ**.

11. M **וּדִין אֱלֹמֹנוֹת**. This makes the line a tetrameter; **דִּין** only occurs again in I S. xxiv. 16, and is improbable. To a practised eye **אֱלֹמֹנוֹת** is only a corrupt form of **אֱלֹהִים בְּמַעוֹן** (l. 12). **וּדִין** must represent a second plural to **יְתוּמִים**. Read **וְגִירִים** (cp. xciv. 6), omitting

13 f. I return to M's reading **מוֹשִׁיב** (Ol., Lag., Du., &c., see l. 15. Point **בֵּיתָהּ**, and for **יְחִידִים** read **נִדְחִים** (2 S. xiv. 13). **יְחִידִים** cannot mean 'desolate' (see on xxv. 16); so independently Herz. For **בְּבוֹשָׁרוֹת** read **בְּצִדְקָתוֹ**. M's reading is not very suitable,

and is an Aramaism (see *ZAT*, i. [81], 131).—M's אֶדְ-סוֹרְרִים שְׁכָנוֹ has caused much trouble, and צַחֲחָה is a *ἀπ. λεγ.* (G S, 'grave,' whence S. Rau, 1764, inferred צַחֲחָה<sup>1</sup>). Read אֶדְ-יִשְׁכְּנוּ חֲצִירִי.

16. Omit אֱלֹהִים (metre).

17. For בִּישִׁימוֹן (a corruption of מִישְׁמַעְאֵל) read either מִשְׁדָּה אֲרָם or מִשְׁ אֲדָם. אֲרָם is preferable (see exeg. note).

18 f. For נִטְפוּ read נִלְטוּ (Loeb); see Judg. v. 4, corrected text. From the same source insert נִלְטוּ נִטְפוּ מִיָּם. Omit אֱלֹהִים מִפְּנֵי סִינִי, introduced by a scribe from an already interpolated form of the Song of Deborah (cp. Moore's comm.). Observe פִּסֵּק after רַעְשָׁה. The MS was imperfect, and the scribe who, in obedience to the note סִלָּה (rather לְשִׁלָּם), supplemented it from Judg. v., did not choose quite the right words. (Or is not סִלָּה here, as in other cases, from יִרְחַמָּאֵל ?).

20. Read מִפְּנֵי, and omit אֱלֹהִים (metre).

21 f. M נִשְׁם נְדָבוֹת, 'a rain of generosity' (cx. 3?), referring to the manna (Ps. lxxviii. 24; Kenn., Ol., Hu.) or to literal rain (Hitz., Che., Bā., Kön., Du)? In either case, the expression is improbable, and considering that much besides in the stanza is suspicious, and that we have to get a clear and connected view of the stanza as a whole, correction of the text is indispensable. Read מִמְּנֵי שָׁמַיִם [מֵעַל]; a quotation from Dt. xxxiii. 13. שָׁמַיִם became מִשָּׁם; hence נִשְׁמַ (נ for מ, as in Isa. lix. 10). מִמְּנֵי became נְדָבוֹת; hence מֵעַל dropped out. Singularly enough נִשְׁם is at once a corruption and an explanation, like מַטַּל in Dt. (see Di.). For תִּנְיָף read, not תִּטִּיף (Lag., Gr., Now., Du.), but תִּבְרִיף (cp. Dt. *l.c.*).

23 ff. Superficial corrections are useless. For וּנְלָאָה read וּמְלָאָה (Krochm., Gr.), and for חֲבִיתָךְ (surely not='thy band') read לְחִמְךָ; Canaan is called אֶרֶץ לְחֵם, Isa. xxxvi. 17; cp. Gen. xli. 54. For יִשְׁבּוּ and לַעֲנִי read יִשְׁבְּעוּ (Ps. cxl. 14) and לָעֵם<sup>2</sup> (Gr.). Omit אֱלֹהִים, a variant to אֲדָנִי.

26 ff. This stanza can no doubt be translated, but not satisfactorily. The chief difficulties are (a) אָמַר, (b) מְבַשְּׂרוֹת, (c) יִדְרוּ (twice), (d) נִוְת־בֵּית. (a) Promise? Song of triumph? (b) A 'host' of singing women? (c) The archaic affirmative? Why twice? (d) Does a word

<sup>1</sup> Mentioned by Moore, *Judges*, p. 266, note ||.

<sup>2</sup> So also lately Du.; Gr. is unmentioned.

נָוָה, נָוָה exist? If so, what does it mean? *Hausfrau* is too bold. No ancient interpreter found this sense (G *ὡραιότης*; J *pulchritudo*). Utilizing all the letters of the text, and applying the usual methods, read perhaps thus,—

נְבִיאָה נָתַן אֱלֹהִים  
מִבְּשֶׁרֶת בָּצַע רָב  
[בְּרָחוֹ] מַלְכֵי צָבָאוֹת  
[הוֹשִׁיעַ] אֲדָנִי יִדְדִי  
יוֹנָתָן תְּחִלָּה שָׁלַל

In **A** 1 either אֲדָנִי or אֹמֵר must represent some fem. substantive, to which מִבְּשֶׁרֶת (sing.) refers. אֱלֹהִים is so often corrupted that we shall do best to suppose אֹמֵר with the following הָ to represent אֱלֹהִים, and to seek an underlying fem. subst. in אֲדָנִי. The larger context suggests 'Deborah a prophetess' (Judg. iv.) as the person intended; read נְבִיאָה. נָתַן for יָתַן is due to Gr. So also Herz, who observes that נִ precedes. He also proposes אֹמֵרָה מִבְּשֶׁרֶת, but בָּשָׂר implies a human agent. רָב צָבָא has not been questioned. But the context requires בָּצַע רָב (cp. Judg. v. 19). בְּרָחוּ easily fell out after רָב; some verb seems to be required, for one of the two יִדְדִי is surely יִדְדִי; cp. G *τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ*. The second יָד must surely come from אֲדָנִי, the true verb should be either הוֹשִׁיעַ or some synonym. Reading יוֹנָתָן (cp. Cant. ii. 14) we obtain a connexion with the next stanza. בֵּית (נִית) is dittographed. Gr., however, בֵּית, עֲנֹת בֵּית.

31 ff. Scarcely any sound work has been done on this stanza, and yet under methodical treatment it yields up its secret. The key to the main difficulties is to be found in Judg. v. 16, where render, 'Why sittest thou among the ash-mounds (reading as p. 292, *l.* 5), to hear the mockery of the Arabians (שְׂרָקַת עֲרָבִים)', and *v.* 18, where Zebulun and Naphtali are eulogized for their heroism. The riddles of *ll.* 33, 34 are solved by remembering two of the very commonest sources of error in transcription, repetition and transposition of letters. Read:—

אִם-תִּשָּׁכַח בֵּין שְׂפָתַיִם 31  
כְּנַפֶּיהָ יִחַפֶּה בְּכַסֶּף 32  
וְאֶבְרוֹתֶיהָ בְּחָרוֹץ 33  
בְּשִׁפְרִיר מְלָכִים תִּשָּׁב 34  
[עַם נִפְתָּלִי] וּבָלוֹן 35

In *l.* 31 תִּשָּׁכַח was originally תִּשָּׁכַח בֵּין (dittographed). Almost

so Gr. (he reads תשכן). M's שְׁפָתִים is certainly wrong, so far as the dual goes. Probably we should read שְׁפָתִים. אֲשַׁפְּתוֹת or שְׁפָתוֹת would be more correct (cp. Kön. iia, 184, top), but since the true text in Judg. v. 16 is probably צִפְתִּים (Zephathites), it is hazardous to alter the ending. Probably the late psalmist took שְׁפָתִים to mean 'ash-mounds'; cp. cxiii. 7. In l. 32 יוֹנָה seems to be a (correct) gloss. The נ became dittographed in נחפה; the subject of יחפה is of course 'Yahwè.' בִּירְקֶק (with greenish or yellowish) will surely not do. חר comes from חר twice repeated in error. In l. 34 M's בִּפְרֵשׁ שְׁדֵי is unsuitable. 'Shaddai' does not occur elsewhere in Ps. lxxviii., nor at all in Judg. v.; פֶּרֶשׁ means 'to spread out.' It would seem that some letters of the text must have dropped out owing to the operation of the opposite to the dittographic principle. The above restoration is suggested by Judg. v. 18. Of earlier corrections the most plausible is Krochmal's צִלְמוֹת for צִלְמוֹן derived from T. Duhm ('like snow on Zalmon') overlooks the dubious character of 'Zalmon' in Judg. ix. 48; so also does Lagarde (בְּהַר הַשִּׁלָּן = 'on Hermon,' opposed to 'on Zalmon'). See 'Zalmon,' *Enc. Bib.*

36 f. For אֱלֹהִים read יִרְחֵמָאֵל. The 'mount of God,' acc. to the poet, is Zion. Indeed, הַר אֱלֹהִים, a title applied to Horeb (Ex. iii. 1, &c.), is probably a corruption of הַר יִרְחֵמָאֵל. For בָּשָׁן (unexpected and difficult) read כַּלְשָׁן. G's ὄρος πῖον (i.e. הַר דָּשָׁן; G xxii. 13), gives no help. Read נֶבֶלֶן (see on xxix. 5f.) for נֶבֶלָנִים (twice) G ὄρος τετυρωμένον, ὄρη τετυρωμένα ('A ὠφρυωμένα). נֶבֶלָן is supposed to mean a conical peak with a flattened top (Wetzstein). Del. imagines a contrast between the sombre majesty of the boldly formed rocks of the Bashan mountain-range and the softer formation of the porous limestone rock of Zion. This is highly precarious. The form נֶבֶלָן too is uncertain; and even apart from this we have no reason to expect such a peculiar phrase. Nor is it probable that the psalmist would have chosen the mountains of Bashan rather than the sacred mountains of the south (Horeb or Sinai was originally placed in the Negeb) as rivals to Zion. Read הַר הַנֶּגֶב. The final מ should be attached to הַר.—For תִּמְצִדֶּן, a ἀπ. λεγ. hazardingly explained from the Arabic, read תִּמְקִדֶּן (cxiv. 4, K<sup>al</sup>), with Gr., Loeb, or rather, for metre and for consistency with l. 36, תִּמְקֶד, with הַר

41 ff. The traditional text of vv. 18, 19 is unintelligible. G begins τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ θεοῦ μυριοπλάσιον, χιλιάδες εὐθηνούτων. רַבְתִּים 'many myriads'? So Kautzsch (*Theol. LZ*, '84, p. 131; Ges.<sup>(26)</sup>, § 97h), who thinks tl.at אֶלְפֵי שָׁנָא (for שָׁנִין) is a gloss which decides רַבְתִּים to

be in sense multiplicative, not dual. But שָׁנִין does not occur, and the ancients had a different text. G read שְׁאַנְנִים; 'A Σ presuppose שְׁאֵנוֹן, which Bā. even adopts ('Tausende lauten Getümmels'). Kōn., We., &c. agree with Kautzsch as to שְׁנָאֵן, but Lag., Nestle, Bi., Hilgenf. read יִשְׂרָאֵל, Gr. ἰσῆροῦ; cp. Num. x. 36. Clearly we should read כּוֹשֵׁן.

The closing words of v. 18 are a *crux interpretum*; G translates, but does not interpret (ὁ κύριος ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν Σινα, ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ). The correction בָּא מִסִּינִי (Pott, Ol., Kau., We., &c.), cp. Dt. xxxiii. 2, is too superficial. The hardest word to correct is רַבְתִּים, but when the rest of the passage has been set in order, a possible correction will occur. אֲדָנִי בִם is almost certainly a corruption of יֵרַחֲמָאִים, which in turn is a correction of אֱלֹהִים (cp. on l. 36).—G continues, ἀναβὰς εἰς ὑψος ἡχμαλωτέουσας αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔλαβες δύματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ γὰρ ἀπειθοῦντες τοῦ κατασκευάσαι; but Σ in the last line makes Yahwè the subject—ἔτι καὶ ἐν ἀπειθοῦσι κατασκευάσαι. שְׁבִית שְׁבִי satisfies neither sense nor metre. מִתְּנוֹת is not used elsewhere for 'tribute' (cp. S T, and Eph. iv. 8), and בָּאֲדָם after לָקַחַת is very improbable. We might indeed read בָּאֲדָמָה, with Gr., but the rest of the stanza is so corrupt that we cannot safely accept this. What can be the meaning of וְאֵף סוֹרְרִים לְשֹׁכֵן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים? Observe the warning Pasek. The versions give no help. לֹא שִׁכְנוּ (Land, Dys., We., Du., after S) is suggested by a too optimistic view of M in v. 7. We have the key, however, and know that the Jerahmeelites are still referred to; יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים is a corruption of יֵרַחֲמָאִים. For סוֹרְרִים read יִשְׂרָאֵל (cp. l. 15), and for לְשֹׁכֵן read יִשְׁכְּנוּ. לָקַחַת should probably be חֲלֶקֶת (so Morinus, on account of the ἔδωκεν of Eph. iv. 8). It is now time to emend the improbable רַבְתִּים; a verb is required, read בּוֹרֶת. The whole stanza may be restored nearly thus:—

חֲבֵר יֵרַחֲמָאִים בּוֹרֶת  
 אֶלְפֵי כּוֹשֵׁן בְּקָדֶשׁ  
 עֲלִית לְמָרוֹם יְבוּסִי  
 חֲלֶקֶת אֲרָמְנוֹת יֵרַחֲמָאֵל  
 אֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁכְּנוּ

lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup> 1. For אֲדָנִי read יְהוָה, and for the first יוֹם (note Pasek) read אֱלֹהִים (see on xcv. 7). The second יוֹם is a dittogram. In ס, יַעֲמֵס is a dittographed מ; יַעֲמֵס=אֵימ=אֱלֹהִים, the לָה having been expelled by לָנוּ which follows. לָנוּ itself is a fragment of בְּאֵלָנוּ; Schlögl, יַעֲמֵס, not keen enough. אֶל יִשׁוּעַתָּנוּ [ה], which follows in MT, is misplaced. סֶלָה is a corruption of אֱלֹהִים, which should stand at the head of l. 2; read, however,



2 f. M **הָאֵל לָנוּ**. Read probably **הַצִּילָנוּ**. The improbable **לְמוֹשָׁעוֹת** should be **יְשׁוּעָתָנוּ**; it was corrupted under the influence of **לְמוֹת תּוֹצְאוֹת**, itself doubtless corrupt. **[וּלִי]יְהוָה אֲדָנִי** is non-existent in genuine Hebrew. The four other *supposed* occurrences are cix. 21, cxl. 8, cxli. 8, Hab. iii. 19. The true text of *v.* 21*b* can be recovered by the help of the corrupt word **לְמוֹשָׁעוֹת**, which does duty both for **יְשׁוּעָתָנוּ** and for **תַּעֲצֻמוֹת**. **לְעַמּוֹ** was miswritten **לְמוֹ** (cp. xxviii. 8). Then a mark of abbreviation was imagined (**לְמוֹ**)—the reverse of the error in Isa. liii. 8. The words underlying **יְהוָה אֲדָנִי** will now be clear. Read *ll.* 1—3 thus:—

**בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים נִצְּלָנוּ  
יְהוָה חֲצִילָנוּ אֵל יְשׁוּעָתָנוּ  
אֱלֹהִים הוּא נָתַן לְעַמּוֹ תַּעֲצֻמוֹת**

4 f. M **רָאשׁ אִיבּוֹ**. Read **שַׁר עֲרֵבִים ו** (cp. on xxxvi. 2, cx. 6*b*).—M **קִדְקֹד שַׁעַר מִתְּהַלֵּל**. Read **[ו]נִגִּיד אֲשׁוּר מִתְּהַלֵּל**. For **שַׁעַר**, Hal. **שִׁנְעָר**; Kr., Gr., Dy., **רִשְׁעָר**; Burgess **שַׁעִיר**.

6 f. M **מִבֶּשֶׁן אָשִׁיב**. The sense required by the context is this,—Israel, oppressed and well nigh extinct, is to be gratified by the spectacle of the supernatural destruction of his foes. But why is Bashan specially mentioned? Contemporary history has been thought to supply an answer. The reference might be to the dispersion of Israelites consequent on the war between Antiochus III. and Ptolemy IV. (cp. *OP* 114 f.), or to the existence of Jewish proselytes beyond the Jordan in the Greek period (We., *I/JG*, 163); Duhm even goes so far down as the time of Alexander Jannæus, who extended his conquests as far as Lake Huleh. But a parallel passage in Amos (ix. 3) is conclusive against such interpretations. Whoever wrote **מִבֶּשֶׁן אָשִׁיב** had in his mind a divine judgment on the foes of Israel, and if this view will not suit the context, **מִבֶּשֶׁן** must be a scribe's error, and must be corrected. (It will be remembered that elsewhere—xxii. 13 and lxviii. 16—'Bashan' has been introduced by an error.) Lagarde (*Semit.* i. 52) proposes **מִבְּבֶשֶׁן** 'from the smelting-furnace,' cp. xxi. 10, Dan. iii. 6, 11; also Ps. lxvi. 12, Isa. xliii. 2. But the figure of smelting would certainly have received some development; note also that **כֶּבֶשֶׁן** only occurs in Gen. xix. 28, Ex. ix. 8, 10, xix. 18. The true reading is **מִכְּבֶּשֶׁן** (cp. *v.* 16); continue **אָשִׁיבָה**, and in *l.* 7 **בְּנִידָה אָשִׁיב** (metre). In *l.* 7 note also **מִצְלוֹת**; cp. lxvi. 11*a* (corr. text), lxix. 3. In *l.* 7 read **וּמִתִּימָן מִמְּצָר בְּנִידָה אָשִׁיב**; so metre and exegetical consistency are satisfied.

8 f. That **תִּמְחֹץ** is unsuitable (note Pasek), has long been seen; to suppose a new sense 'to drench' (cp. Ass. *mahāṣu* II.), with Frd. Del.

(*Prol.* 69 ff.), and Ruben (*Crit. Rem.* 19) is hazardous. But the whole of *v.* 24 is open to question, and a thorough revision of the text becomes necessary. Neither תרחץ (G S T J?—Hare, Kenn., Street, Bö., Ol., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Bā., We., Du.), nor תחמץ (Kr., Hi., Gr., cp. Kimḥi), nor תחמץ lends itself to any plausible interpretation. The corrected text of *ll.* 4 f. suggests לַמַּעַן תִּרְמַס הַיְכָלִי אָרַם, and for the detestable clause which now forms *v.* 24<sup>b</sup>, לָבוֹס בְּרַגְלֶיךָ אֲרַמְנוֹת עֲרָבִים. The scribe seems to have confused the two words ברגלֶיךָ and הַיְכָלִי. The coherence of this part of the poem now becomes visible.

11 f. M ראו הליכותֶיךָ. G, however (and so Street, Du.), נִרְאוּ. But the difficulty of the next word remains. Hab. iii. 6b may seem to be parallel, but Hab. iii. is full of corrupt passages, and *v.* 6b seems to be one of these. The right reading in *l.* 11 seems to be סִפְרוּ כָל־נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ יהוה (הליכִי is a combination of כל with a fragment of a word ending in ותיך).—M הליכות. Read הִלְלוּךָ; ת is an expansion of a fragmentary ל. Cp. on lxxi. 22.

13 f. M שָׁרִים. Read שָׁרִים (G; Gr.); see *v.* 28.—Read מִנְגִּנִּים.—To תוֹפְפוֹת add בְּחִלְלוֹת, which in MT (cp. G) appears as מִקְהִלוֹת [ב].

16 f. M's במקהלות does double duty (see last note). Here it stands for בְּמִוְהִיכְלוֹ.—Point בִּרְכּוֹ (Ew., Gr., Du.).—M's אֲדָנִי does double duty for יְרוֹמָמוֹ (cp. on cxviii. 2) and for יְהוָה.—M מִמְקוֹר; read מִחוֹקֶק (Ps. lxxx. 5, corr. text; Isa. xxxiii. 22?), with Gr.

18. Note Pasek, and read שָׁרֵי בְנֵימִין הַצֵּעִיר יְדִידִים. For יְדִידִים (Herz's suggestion for the impossible רִידִם, *G év êkostírei*), cp. Dt. xxxiii. 12. Schnurrer (*Animadvers.* 308) thought of דָּדִם—not so far wrong. Herz's reconstruction of *v.* 28 is as follows, שָׁרֵי יְדִידִים שָׁרֵי שָׁם בְּנֵימִין צֵעֵר | יְהוּדָה | תִּרְנִים כִּשְׁרֵי זְבוּלוֹן. For תִּרְנִים he refers to Gen. xlix. 13.

19. Read שָׁרֵי יְהוּדָה הָרַב תִּמְיָמִים. The last two words replace M's רִנָּתָם. The correction רִגְשָׁתָם would be unsuitable, even if the occurrences of רִגַּשׁ elsewhere were trustworthy. J's 'in purpura sua' is a mere guess, though as such not bad. תִּמְיָמִים is highly probable; ג and מ, ר and ת are often confounded.

21 f. M's view of *v.* 29 is no better than a makeshift; hence *ll.* 21, 22 must receive radical but not arbitrary corrections, among which, however, we need not include צוּה for צוּה (vss., and most moderns).—M אֱלֹהֶיךָ עֲנֵה. Read אֱמַתְךָ וְחִסְדְּךָ, and prefix יהוה (for אֱלֹהִים, represented, equally with אֱמַתְךָ, by אֱלֹהֶיךָ). Cp. on xlii. 9.—M עֲנֵה. Read perhaps יִשְׁמְרוּ (cp. lxi. 8); ע = ש, ז = ר, ה = מ. •

23. M **נָעַר חַיַּת קָנָה** (Street **נָעַר**). This is not self-evidently wrong; Job xl. 21 suggests a reference to Behemoth as a symbol of the Egyptian power (see 'Behemoth,' *Enc. Bib.*). But this is against the usage of the psalmists; we expect either 'Leviathan' or '*tannin*' (cp. lxxiv. 13f.), and the parallelism shows that a plural noun must have been intended. What the original phrase was, depends on the true reading of l. 27. We shall see presently that the writer is thinking of Ps. xxii., and that he has this before him, in a more correct form than that presented by M. We may therefore safely read **נָעַר חַיַּת קָרְנֵי הַשָּׁן** (see Ps. xxii., l. 26).

24. M **בְּעִנְיֵי עַמִּים | עֲדַת אֲבִירִים**; note Pasek. The emendation **בְּעִנְיֵי עַמִּים** (Bishop Hare and Kennicott, and independently Matthes, followed by Che. '88) is plausible; cp. Isa. xvi. 8. But this leaves **נ** unaccounted for, and the corruption in *l.* 31 is so deep that we cannot but fear that a more radical correction is required. Almost or quite certainly the poet has Ps. xxii. in his mind, and the right reading is (**עֲדַת רִאשִׁים לְבָאִים אֲבִירִים** (?) *on* xxii. *l.* 37 f.).

25. M **בָּנִי**. Read **פָּנִי** (cp. liii. 6 &c.); G S J support an imperative. —M **קָרְבוֹת**; suspicious (see on lv. 22). Nestle renders 'offerings'; Duhm, 'visits to the temple.' But we should probably read **הַתְּנִרוֹת** (construction as in Job xiii. 3).

26 ff. Corruption and dislocation have almost ruined the sense. No slight corrections are adequate. Thus Nestle's corrections **בְּשִׁמְנִים** (for **חֲשִׁמְנִים**) and **מִפְתָּרִים** (for **מִתְרַפֵּס**), in *JBL*, x. 151, accepted by the writer in *JBL*, xi. 125, and Hitzig's **תְּרִיץ** for **תְּרִיץ** must be declined. We have first to deal with *l.* 30, the former part of which is hardly translatable. That it is misplaced, seems to be clear; the bringing of tribute naturally comes after the 'menace' (**נָעַר**, *l.* 31) has produced its effect. The passage should therefore be parallel to lxxii. 9 f.; at any rate, we may fitly take an idea from this passage. **מִהִכְלָךְ** ought to conceal some verb; lxxii. 9 suggests **יִכְרְעוּ**. Cases of the confusion of **כ** and **ע** have come before us already; and an imperfect **ה** might be mistaken for **ר**. That **עַל** and **כָּל** can be confounded, is also well-known, and it is plain that **יְרוּשָׁלַם** might as easily be miswritten for **יִשְׁמַעְאֵל** as for **יִשְׂרָאֵל**. Lastly, **מֶלֶךְ** is one of the commonest disguises of **ל**. Read therefore:—

**יִכְרְעוּ לְךָ כָּל-יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים  
לְךָ יוֹבִילוּ יִרְחֲמָאִים שִׁי**

We have next to deal with **מִתְרַפֵּס בְּרִצִּיכָסָף**. The presumption is that **מֵת** conceals an ethnic name parallel to those in the above two lines. Nestle's **מִפְתָּרִים** suggests **פִּתְרָסִים**, a name which actually

occurs in M, Gen. x. 14, where it stands amongst various descendants of מצרים, *i.e.* Miṣrim (in N. Arabia), not Miṣraim (Egypt); see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Mizraim.' We can hardly doubt, however, that for פתרים both in Gen. x. 14 and (*ex hyp.*) in our psalm we should read צרפתים; 'Zarephathites' and 'Jerahmeelites' were closely related peoples. ברצי should of course be באוצר. The missing verb stands in M at the head of v. 32, though more probably, since אתה is not a word of the psalmists, יאתיו should be corrected into ישתחוו. The rest of v. 32 contains in a corrupt form the tetrameter corresponding to באוצר צרפתים ישתחוו (L. 28, just recovered). The last word, however, may be omitted; פשם is a corruption of ירחמאלים, which is a gloss either on פשים or on the corrupt מלכים of l. 27 (τ. 30b). חשמיני has grown out of פשים out of מנימצרים, and תריץ out of חרוץ (lxxii. 10), ידיו out of יקריבו (*ibid.*). Line 29 therefore becomes חרוץ ומצרים פשים יקריבו. [Gunkel, *Schöpfung*. 67, reads in v. 31a ים מתרפס צרף מבססף, 'the troubled sea be made purer than silver,' a phrase for a judgment upon the warlike peoples? ?]

32. Prefix יה הללו, which first became indistinct and then, through its resemblance to לאלהים, which precedes, dropped out. For אדני read יהוה.

33. MG סלה (τ. 33, end). Hu. rightly saw that סלו = סלה (l. 9), but not that סלו ל comes out of הללו. G, feeling the need of a verb, prefixes ψάλατε τῷ θεῷ = זמרו אלהים, which Ley adopts (except אלהים); cod. א, however, omits.—M שמי שמיקדם. Lag., Now., omit the second שמי as a dittogram. שמי שמיקדם is a possible phrase. But there is here no special sense in referring to the heavens as *primæval*. We should rather expect to hear of the God of *primæval* times, as in Dt. xxxiii. 27. Correct M's reading into במתי שחקים (see lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> l. 9 and cf. Dt. xxxiii. 26, Isa. xiv. 14; also Ps. lxxvii. 18).

34 f. Insert from lxviii.<sup>(1)</sup> l. 10. For קול עז read תחיל ארץ.

36. Omit על, from אל, a fragment of אלהי (which read for אלהים).

38 f. Note two Pasesks. M במקדשיך; not quite natural. Read perhaps בניה קדשו (Ex. xv. 13); ה fell out; מ=נו. Omit ו, and read לעמו. Transfer אל ישראל to end of psalm, reading נאל. So the line and the psalm are fitly completed.

## PSALM LXIX.—I.

**TRIMETERS.** The pious kernel of the community (the Israel within Israel) complains of its sufferings. The N. Arabian foes continue their outrages, and renegade Jews have dissociated themselves from their brethren, afraid of the

insults which fall so plentifully on those who are zealous for Yahwè's house. The psalm is artificial and imitative; the use made of Pss. xviii., xxii., and xxxv. in stanzas 1, 2, 5, 7, 10 is specially remarkable, but cp. also references in the notes to par. passages in Pss. xxxviii., xlv., and Jer. xv. 15 (in a passage surely of post-exilic origin). The curse in vv. 23-29 reminds us of those in lviii. 8-10 (corr. text) and cix.<sup>(1)</sup> The text has in parts suffered considerably, and it is precisely some of the most corrupt portions which have served as the chief supports of the erroneous view that the speaker of the psalm is an individual. Duhm, for instance, observes on v. 5 (end) that the enemies of the poet seek to ruin him by accusing him before the judge of peculation; a similar explanation is given by this critic of Ps. xxxv. (see introd. to this psalm). He assigns the psalm to an Asidæan opponent of Alcimus (1 Macc. vii. 5-18); see crit. n. on II. 51 f. At an earlier date Hitzig induced a number of critics to assign Ps. lxi., as well as Pss. xxx., xxxv., &c., to Jeremiah. Consistent criticism, however, enables us to form a much more probable view both of Jeremiah and of his writings than was formerly possible (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Jeremiah').

*Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Of 'Arab-ethan.*

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  | Deliver me, O Yahwè [my God] !                                 | 2  |
|    | For [the floods of] Deathland have overwhelmed me.             |    |
|    | I sink into [the midst of] the ocean,                          | 3  |
|    | Into an abyss where there is no ground,                        |    |
|    | I am come into depths of water,                                |    |
|    | And the flood [of Deathland] overwhelms me.                    |    |
|    | With my crying my throat is parched,                           | 4  |
|    | Mine eyes look longingly for my God :                          |    |
|    | Zarephath and Asshur are in great number,                      | 5  |
| 10 | Ishmael and Jerahmeel are many. <sup>1</sup>                   |    |
|    | O Yahwè ! thou knowest mine anguish,                           | 6  |
|    | My groans are not hidden from thee.                            |    |
|    | Let not those that hope in thee <sup>2</sup> be shamed         |    |
|    | Let not those that seek thee <sup>3</sup> be disgraced in me ! | 7  |
|    | For on thine account do I bear insult,                         | 8  |
|    | Contumely covers my face ;                                     |    |
|    | I am become a stranger to my brothers,                         | 9  |
|    | An alien to the sons of my mother,                             |    |
|    | Yea, zeal for thy house has consumed me,                       | 10 |
| 20 | The insults of those that insult thee have fallen upon me.     |    |
|    | I bowed down my head like a bulrush (?),                       | 11 |
|    | And it brought insults upon me.                                |    |
|    | I took sackcloth for my clothing,                              | 12 |
|    | And made myself their byword ;                                 |    |
|    | Those that hate me condemn me in the gate,                     | 13 |
|    | And oppose me with lying words.                                |    |

<sup>1</sup> The Ishmaelites, the Arabians, the Cushites, the Jerahmeelites, the Asshurites.

<sup>2</sup> O Lord, Yahwè Sebaoth.

<sup>3</sup> O God of Israel.

- But as for me, unto thee, O Yahwè ! is my prayer ;<sup>1</sup> 14  
 Do thou succour me with thy delivering right hand !  
 Rescue me from the mire that I sink not, 15  
 30 Let me escape<sup>2</sup> from the depths of water.  
 Let not the flood of Deathland overwhelm me, 16  
 Let not the abyss [of the sea] swallow me up,  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 And let not the pit shut its mouth upon me.  
 Answer me, O Yahwè ! according to thy gracious  
 kindness, 17  
 • According to thy plenteous compassion turn towards  
 me.  
 Hide not thy face from thy servant ; 18  
 For I am in distress—do thou answer me speedily.  
 Draw near to my soul and release it, 19  
 40 Because of mine enemies set me free.  
 Thou knowest my contumely, 20  
 My shame and my dishonour are before thee.  
 The assembly of my foes have insulted me, 20 end, 21  
 Those that hate me have broken my heart :  
 I looked for one to condole, but there was none,  
 For comforters, but I found them not.  
 They give kicks to my stripes, 22  
 And strike me in my wounds.  
 Let their paths be wrapped in gloom, 23  
 50 In deep gloom and darkness ;  
 Let their eyes become dark that they see not, 24  
 Their loins make thou to shake continually !  
 Pour out thy fervent wrath upon them, 25  
 Let thy hot anger overtake them ;  
 Let their castles be desolate, 26  
 Let there be none to dwell in their palaces,  
 For they persecute those whom thou hast smitten, 27  
 And add to the pain of thy pierced ones.  
 Do thou put on more guilt to their guilt, 28  
 60 And let them not enjoy the the sight of thy righteous-  
 ness.

<sup>1</sup> In an acceptable time, O God ! in thy plenteous kindness.

<sup>2</sup> From Ishmael and. •

Let them be wiped out of the book of life, 29  
 And not be enrolled with the righteous.  
 As for me, I am poor and in sore pain ; 30  
 Let thy deliverance, O Yahwè ! set me on high.

2 ff. The sea meant is that which rolls above the world of the dead. Cp. xviii. 5 f. (already corrupt?), xl. 3, lxxxviii. 6 f., Lam. iii. 54.

7. The same line recurs in the true text of xxii., l. 35. Cp. also xxxv., l. 16.

9. The speaker's courage fails at the sight of the N. Arabians—a sign perhaps of the conventionality of the description. (See xxvii.<sup>(1)</sup>, ll. 3-6, xxxv. ll. 9-14, for a contrast.)

11 f. See crit. n.—*Thou knowest*. An appeal to God's omniscience. See l. 43; Jer. xv. 15, xvii. 16, xviii. 23.—*In me, i.e.* in my person. The speaker is himself a representative of the class of those that hope in Yahwè and that seek him.

15 f. **On this account.** So xlv. 23a; Jer. xv. 15.—*Covers*, &c. Cp. xlv. 16.

17 f. Cp. xxxi. 12, xxxv. 13 f., xxxviii. 12.—19. *Zeal for thy house, i.e.* for the temple, the cultus of which was despised by the enemy; or possibly (Hitz.) for the ordering of thy household (Num. xii. 7), *i.e.* the land and people of Israel.—*Has consumed me*. Cp. cxix. 139.

20. **Of those that insult thee**, *i.e.* specially the N. Arabians (xlv. 17, lxxiv. 10).

21 ff. See crit. notes, and cp. xxxv., ll. 15-18 (crit. and exeg. notes).—34. *The pit, i.e.* the grave (see on xl. 3).

43. **The assembly, &c.** Cp. מְרַעִים קָהָל, xxvi. 5; עֵדֶת מ', xxii. 17; also vii. 8, lxxxvi. 14.

45 f. **For one to condole, &c.** Cp. Job ii. 11, and crit. n.—47 f. The reference in the traditional text to gall and vinegar is difficult. In Jer. viii. 14, ix. 14, xxiii. 15, 'water of gall' (רֶאֶשׁ) is mentioned as 'a conceivable drink' (cp. the Arabic parallel quoted by Bähgen); in the two latter passages 'wormwood' (לְעֵנָה) as a food that might be eaten. Here, however, the text speaks of 'gall' (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Gall') as eaten, and of 'vinegar' (חֲמִץ) as a drink. But the text is corrupt; the true text can be restored in the light of xxii.<sup>(1)</sup>, l. 40. See crit. n., and cp. below on l. 60.—49 f. For the figure of darkness, cp. lviii. 9 (corr. text), xxxv. 6a.

55. **Their castles.** Cp. on ix. 7.—57. *Smitten, i.e.* chastised. Cp. 'my stripes,' 'my wounds,' l. 47, and note on l. 63.

60. See crit. n.—61. *The book of life.* Cp. Ex. xxxii. 32. Mal. iii. 16, Dan. xii. 1. The image is derived from the civic lists which, from the end of the ninth century, seem to have been kept as a security against aliens (Bertholet, *Stellung der Israel. zu den Fremden*, 80).—63. כּוֹאֵב ; cp. מְכַאֵב, l. 60. There we hear of sufferers, here of a sufferer (*i.e.* Israel).

**Critical Notes.** 1. Insert אֱלֹהִי (as l. 8), for metre.—2. M כִּי בָאוּ כִּים עֲדֶנְפֶּשׁ. בָּאוּ was produced by the editor out of the fragments of אֶפְפוּ (M, xviii. 5), which has come out of שִׁטְפוּ מִים. שִׁטְפוּ has come from מוֹת (which G<sup>L</sup> reads, 2 S. xxii. 5); שִׁטְפוּ (see v. 16) has dropped out. The passage is dependent on xviii. 5; cp. xl. 13 (a more corrupt form). עֲדֶנְפֶּשׁ seems to have developed out of שִׁטְפוּנִי.—3. M בָּיוֹן. Read בִּים (see on xl. 3), or rather בִּלְבָב יָמִים (Jon. ii. 4; cp. Prov. xxiii. 34).—4. M מְצוּלָה. Read בְּמְצוּלָה. מְצוּלָה and יָם go together; cp. lxviii. 23, Ex. xlv. 4 f.—6. Insert מוֹת (metre and sense); xviii. 5 f. was already

corrupt.—7 f. Omit **יִנְעַתִּי**, a corrupt dittogram of **בִּקְרָאִי**, and **מִיחַל**, a corruption of **אֱלֹהִים** (a variant of **אֱלֹהֵי**).

9 f. I read **רְבוּ צָרַפַּת וְאִשׁוּר | יִשְׁמַעְאֵל וִירַחְמָאֵל עֲצָמוֹ**. M is full of difficulty. 'My causeless haters are more than the hairs of my head' is surely intolerable. We might indeed emend **מִשְׁעֵרוֹת הָאִשִּׁי** into the more poetical **מְרִיסִים** (cp. on lxv. 11, lxxii. 6), but the hyperbole would still remain. **מִצְמִיתִי** is equally suspicious, (1) because parallelism requires that l. 10, like l. 9, should contain a figure, and (2) because of the repetition of the letters **מ** and **צ** in this and in the preceding word (**עֲצָמוֹ**). Hare, Kenn., Street, Ew., and Gr. read **מִצְמִיתִי** or **מִצְמִיתִי**, 'præ comâ meâ,' but **צִמָּה** means rather a woman's veil, and, apart from this, the sense would be too tautological. S implies **מִעֲצָמֹתִי** (so Ol., Hu., Dy., Bi.<sup>(1)</sup>, Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, Kau., Bâ.); cp. Job iv. 14 (?). But this seems to produce an anti-climax. **אֵיבִי שָׂקָר** is also very questionable (see on xxxv. 19), and the sense of the last clause is most improbable (cp. **נֹול** in xxxv. 10). The case seems to be like that of the names of the sons of Heman; see I Chr. xxv. 4, where the names from Giddalti onwards seem to form a (rather poor) poetical couplet, but only if we work upon a corrupt text (see *Enc. Bib.* 'Heman'). The skill of the editor who produced **ז**. 5 in the traditional text (M G) may be admitted, but the result of his work is most unsatisfactory. Slight attempts to improve it, like Lagarde's (**אֲנִי** for **אֵז** &c.), are useless. Most probably we may read as above. Then follows a conventional list of names. I need hardly give the Hebrew (cp. on xl.<sup>(2)</sup>).

11 f. M **וְאִשְׁמֹתִי, לְאִילֹתַי**. 'The poet seems to have been imprudent, and to have been guilty of some irregularities' (Duhm). Surely most inappropriate. Neither here nor in the || Psalm xxii., is confession of guilt intended. Nor does **אִילָת** mean 'imprudence in moral action' (Σ here ἀπειρίαν); see on xxxviii. 6. Read either **חִלְחִלְתִּי** or **חִילָתִי**, and **שְׁוַעֲתִי** (see on xxxviii. 8, 10).

13 f. Omit as glosses **אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** and **אֲדָנִי י' צְבָאוֹת**.

21. M **וְאִכְכָּה**. G<sup>B</sup> *συνέκαμψα*; G<sup>A</sup> corr. *συνεκάλυσα*. The former points to **כָּפַה** (lvii. 7 G; cp. Isa. lviii. 5, G); the latter to **כָּפַה** (2 S. xv. 30, Jer. xiv. 3 G). Herz, with more insight than most, decides for **וְאִכְכָּה** (cohort. of **כָּפַה**). He refers to lvii. 7, and to S, which has, in our passage, **וְאִכְכָּה**, i.e. **וְאִכְכָּה** (cp. Syr. Hex. Isa. lviii. 5), not **וְאִכְכָּה** (as Mich., Lag., Now.). The former reference is not valid, lvii. 7 being corrupt. The latter is cogent; a verb **כָּכַה** (assumed by Lag.) is not found in the O T. But Herz retains **נַפְשִׁי**, which seems to produce an unnatural expression. It is more satisfactory to read **כָּאֲנָמוֹן** and **רָאִשִּׁי**. The suitability of this will be clear from xxxv. 14 f. (corr. text) and Isa. lviii. 5, where 'bowing down the head as a bulrush' is parallel to



'spreading sackcloth and ashes under him' (cp. *l.* 24). The apparent parallelism of xxxv. 14a suggested to many critics (Ol., Dy., Bi., Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We., Kau., Du.) to emend **וַאֲבַכָּה** into **וַאֲעֲנָה**; Kenn. (*Remarks*, 253) and Perles (*Anal.*, 51), however, prefer **וַאֲדַפָּה**. Neither of these is probable; the corruption must lie deeper. It is quite true that the correction here proposed is not in all respects obvious. **נַר**[א]שִׁי might indeed become **נַפְשִׁי** (see on xxiii. 5), but **כְּאִנְמוֹ** is far from **בְּצוֹם**. It is possible, however, that the true reading became indistinct, and that the editor manipulated it (not too dexterously) with some reference to xxxv. 13a. [**וַאֲחַפָּה** \***רֹאשִׁי**] is less satisfactory.]

25 f. **נְגִינָה** does not mean 'jesting ditty,' and does not occur in the plur. (iv. 1, vi. 1, &c. are corrupt); **שִׁיחַ בְּ** 'to make the subject of talk' is improbable. Read, comparing xxxi. 19,—

יִרְשִׁיעֲנִי שִׁנְאִי בַשָּׁעַר  
וַיִּשְׁטַנְנִי בַשְּׂפִתַי שָׁקֵר

Duhm provides an inadequate remedy, changing **יִשְׁחִי בִי** (*v.* 13a) into **יִשְׁחִיחַ**.

27 f. Omit **עֵת רָצוֹן אֱלֹהִים בְּרַב־חֶסֶדֶד**, a scribe's amplification (Isa. lxi. 2) which spoils the metre [**רָצִיחַ נָא**, Herz]. For **עֲנֵנִי** read **דְּוִשִׁיעֲנִי**, and for **בְּיָמֶיךָ יִשְׁעֶךָ בְּאֶמֶת יִשְׁעֶךָ** read **בְּיָמֶיךָ יִשְׁעֶךָ**.

30–34. Omit **מִשְׁנָאִי וְ** (rather **מִישְׁמְעָאֵל וְ**).—For **מִים** read **מָוֶת** (see on *l.* 2).—Read **מְצִילַת יָם** (cp. *ll.* 3 f.; lxviii. 23).—Line 23 has dropped out.—For **תִּתְאֲמַר** (*ἀπ. λεγ.*) read **תִּתְאֲתַם** (Gr.).—For **בְּאֵר** read **בּוֹר=בּוֹר** (as *lv.* 24).

35. For **כִּי טוֹב** read **כְּטוֹב** with Street (1790), Gr., We.

42 f. Here a metrical arrangement has to deviate from that in M. Duhm thinks that **בִּשְׁתִּי וּכְלָמָתִי** has intruded from the following verse, where he would replace it ('und unheilbar ist meine Schande und Beschämung'). Thus we get the couplet, 'Thou knowest my contumely; before thee are all my foes.' A poor parallelism, and opposed, as to *l.* 45, by the par. passage xxxviii. 10. Still less acceptably Altschüller, *ZATW*, 1886, p. 212, and Wellh. 'נָגַד כִּלְ-צִ'. It is much better to read *l.* 44 as in M, taking **כִּלְ-צוּרִי** into *l.* 45, which we may plausibly read thus, **קָהַל צ' חֲרָפוֹנִי**; the Pasek after **חֲרָפָה** may indicate a doubtful text. See on xxxv. 18, and cp. next note.

44. M **שְׁבַרְהָ לִּבִּי וְאָנֹשָׁהּ**. The ordinary view (which prefixes (**חֲרָפָה**) is 1. opposed to metre, and 2. based on the assumption of a *ἀπ. λεγ.* **נָוֶשׁ=אָנֶשׁ** 'to be weak or sick.' G gives (*ὀνειδισμὸν*) *προσεδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν*, where *προσεδ.=שְׁבַרְהָ* and *ταλαιπ.* probably=

**אָנוּשָׁה**, an assumed noun, which is recognised also by Wetzstein (in Del. *Psalmen*<sup>(4)</sup>, 883 ff.) in the sense of 'friendliness' = great calamity (euphemistically). For M's pointing at any rate there is nothing to be said, but who will accept Wetzstein's arbitrary conjecture? Observing that in two passages (Isa. xvii. 11, Jer. xvii. 16) **אָנוּשָׁה** is more than probably corrupt (see *SBOT*, 'Isaiah,' Heb. ed., 195), and that one of the words which are specially liable to be misread is **שָׁנְאִי** (**שׁוֹנְאִי**), and having due regard to *l.* 44, I think we may, provisionally at least, read **שָׁבְרִי לִבִּי שׁוֹנְאִי**, an expression akin to those in Job xix. 1, *a* and *b*. [Tg. implies **וְאָנוּשָׁה**, *i.e.* 'and it (my soul) is sick'; 'A S J agree with M. Weir (*Acad.* 1870, p. 257), **וְאָנוּשָׁה הוּא בְּרָה**; cp. Jer. xvii. 9.]

45. M **לָנוּד** G *συνλειτουργούμενον* = **לָנוּד** ('A S J S T). So Bā., Du.—49 f. See exeg. n. 5. Read,—

**וַיִּבְעֵטוּ בְּחִבְרֹתַי**  
**וּלְפִצְעֵי יִמְחֲצוּנִי**

The couplet is suggested by xxii. 18*b* (corr. text). The corruptions are extremely pretty. **רָאשׁ** springs out of a fragment of **חִבְרֹתַי** just as **חֲמִין** comes from a fragment of **יִמְחֲצוּנִי** (M **יִשְׁקִינִי**).

49 f. Note first that an adj. **שָׁלוֹם** is non-existent (see on lv. 21), and next that a 'table' cannot be said to become a 'net.' Duhm, it is true, suggests that the reference may be to a sacrificial meal, and is thus enabled to improve at once the Hebrew and the parallelism, reading for **שָׁלוֹמִים**, **שְׁלָמִים** 'peace-offerings.' He remarks, 'The enemies appear to have been zealous sacrificers or even priests,' and hence explains the reference to a 'net,' *i.e.* to deceit (1 Macc. vii. 14?). 'Peace-offerings,' he thinks, are mentioned because when Alcimus had become high priest, there was of course no stint with such offerings. The psalmist, however, disparages sacrifices, not upon purely rational grounds, but because he, with the other Asidæans (see introd.), has been expelled by Alcimus's party from the temple. Apart from other considerations, it is decisive against this view that any reading of this couplet which retains a reference to feasting is inconsistent with the following couplet. It is true, Duhm finds in *v.* 24 an allusion to the palsy of Alcimus (1 Macc. ix. 55). But no one reading *vv.* 23 and 24 as they stand in M would naturally fall on Duhm's explanation. The truth is that the text is corrupt, and that no patch-work emendation will suffice. G's **וּלְשָׁלָמִים** (*καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν*; cp. S J, Rom. xi. 9) is of no use. Remembering many parallels, let us read (see exeg. n.),—

**יְדֵיו שְׁבִילֵיהֶם לְאַפְלָה**  
**וּלְצִלְמוֹת וּלְמַחֲשֶׁךְ**

55 f. Duhm regards this couplet as a quotation. But the text plainly needs emendation. מִיִּרְתָּם should mean 'their nomad encampment' (Gen. xxv. 16); G ἡ ἔπαυλις ἀνδῶν. But the worst enemies of the Jews were no mere wandering shepherds. Street, with sound insight, gives, as *v.* 26*a*, 'Let their palaces be desolate.' This seems to be a paraphrase; in *v.* 26*b* he retains 'tents.' Having regard to ix. 7, xlix. 12 (corr. text), we need not hesitate to read בִּירְתָּם. בִּירָה is here used collectively, there being no proper plural (בִּירְנִיּוֹת is used twice in Chron. instead), In *l.* 58 M's אֱהֲלֵיהֶם should certainly be הִכְלִיָּהֶם (see crit. n. on xv. 1).

57 f. M אֶתָּה. Read יָאֵת (Perles, Duhm).—M יִסְפְּרוּ. But אֶל after סִפֵּר is impossible. G προσέθηκαν, *i.e.* יִסְפְּרוּ (Ew., Ol., li.), or יִסְפִּי (Kenn., Street, Gr., Du.), or יִסְפֵּי (We.).

## PSALM LXIX.—2.

**TRIMETERS.** Perhaps an appendix, composed as a refreshing contrast to the preceding poem. The psalmist places himself in the hoped-for day of restoration. Verses 36 and 37 may perhaps, as Dalman has suggested (*TLZ*, Oct. 14, 1893), be a later addition, but this is not a necessary view—the passage may be simply explanatory. The corruption in *v.* 32 has given a false colouring to the whole of the appendix. It is the anticipated relief from N. Arabian oppression which is spoken of. Duhm's view that the circumstances implied are those in 1 Macc. ix. 72 will not agree with our revised text. Cp. xxii. 23–31; also xl.<sup>(2)</sup> and cii.<sup>(2)</sup>, with the respective introductions.

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  | I will praise the name of my God with song,    | 31 |
|    | And magnify him with thanksgiving;             |    |
|    | For Yahwè has disappointed Mišsur,             | 32 |
|    | He has brought to shame Jerahmeel and Ishmael. |    |
|    | Look up, ye poor, and rejoice;                 | 33 |
|    | O ye seekers of Yahwè ! [praise him].          |    |
|    | For Yahwè has hearkened to the needy,          | 34 |
|    | And has not despised his prisoners.            |    |
|    | Let heaven and earth praise him,               | 35 |
| 10 | The sea, and all that moves therein.           |    |
|    | For Yahwè will deliver Zion,                   | 36 |
|    | And build the cities of Judah;                 |    |
|    | [The righteous] will dwell there,              |    |
|    | And possess the [land for ever].               |    |
|    | The offspring of his servants will inherit it, | 37 |
|    | Those that love his name will abide therein.   |    |

3. Praise, the acceptable sacrifice 15. **His servants**, i.e. faithful  
(l. 14, 23).—5 f. Cp. xxii. 27.—7 f. Israelites (xxxiv. 23).  
Cp. xxii. 25.

*Critical Notes.* 1. Read אֱלֹהֵי, which is confounded with אֱלֹהֵי = אֱלֹהִים. G (A<sup>c</sup>. & R<sup>b</sup>) τοῦ θεοῦ μου.

3 f. M פָּר מִקֶּרְן כִּפְרִים (ומפרים, 20 MSS. Kenn., 13 MSS. and 6 edd. de R, G S J). The description of the steer as having horns and claws (see Siegfr. Sta.) is highly superfluous. כִּפְרִים might come from מִצְפִּיר. But most probably the whole distich is corrupt. Comparing xxii. 27–30 (corr. text) read something like this,—

פִּי הִבִּישׁ יְהוָה מִצִּוֹר  
הַחֲפִיר יִרְחֶמָל וַיִּשְׁמָעֵל

5. M וַיִּשְׁמָחוּ, רָאוּ, i.e. *videntes mansueti latabantur* (J; so Del., Bā. &c.). Kön. would read וַיִּשְׁמָחוּ (so 28 MSS., 7 edd. Kenn.; *plurimi*, de R.), supposing that ו dropped out after מ, owing to similarity of sounds (*Synt.*, §§ 162, 330 p.). But comparing xxxiv. 16a (and xxii. 27, xl. 4, corr. text), we should certainly read וַיִּשְׁמָחוּ, רָאוּ (cp. G S). So Gr., Du.—6. M's יְחִי לִבְבָּנֶךָ is a corruption of יִרְחֶמָלִים (xxii. 27), a gloss on ll. 3, 4, which has expelled the right reading הִלְלוּהוּ (*ib.*).—  
7. Read שָׁמַע (Wē.).

- 13 f. Insert צַדִּיקִים, and לְעַבְדְּךָ אֶרְצָא; cp. xxxvii. 29. So Duhm.

## PSALM LXX.

IDENTICAL with xl. 14–18 (which see), save that the opening word רִצָּה is here omitted. See also on Ps. lxxi. The title here runs, 'Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan. Of [Ethan] the Ezrahite.' On לְהוֹכִיר (again in xxxviii. 1) see Intro.

## PSALM LXXI.

TRIMETERS. Largely based on other plaintive psalms, especially xxii., xxxi., xxxv., xl., like which it is Deutero-Isaianic. An editor seems to have prefixed to it a fragment, which now (in an incorrect form) constitutes Ps. lxx., and a prayer from xxxi. 2–4a. These additions did not at all improve the psalm. They weaken the effect of the appeal in v. 5, which is appropriately supported by petitions based on xxii. 10 f. Verses 12 and 13 also appear to be an insertion, the former from xxxviii. 22. The latter is an imitation of xxxv. 26, xl. 15 (Duhm). But the psalm is not devoid of genuine feeling (see especially ll. 7, 8, corr. text). The speaker is the Jewish community (so G, Θ, Theod. Mops., Theodoret, Barhebraeus, Ol., Smend, Bā., Beer, &c.), or rather the inner circle of that community

(see *ll.* 35 f.). This association of earnest believers, who are not to be turned aside from their faith by the sorest troubles, has all along been the true Israel, which Yahwè has trained up to be agents in the conversion both of the nominal Israelites (the outer circle) and of the nations outside. According to Duhm, who regards the psalmist's description as autobiographical, the speaker boasts that, though not versed in apocalyptic writings (see on *l.* 28), he has been a life-long disciple of Yahwè, and will never give up prophesying the future. Such a clairvoyant would naturally appear a 'prodigy' (*zv.* 7, מוֹפֵת) to many; his predictions might, in fact, become very embarrassing. Textual criticism must decide on the correctness of this startling theory.

- |    |  |    |
|----|--|----|
| 1  | O my God ! rescue me from the hand of the wicked,            | 4  |
|    | From the grasp of the unjust and the violent.                |    |
|    | For thou art my hope, <sup>1</sup> O Yahwè!                  | 5  |
|    | My confidence from my youth.                                 |    |
|    | Upon thee have I stayed myself from my birth ;               | 6  |
|    | Thou hast been my refuge from my mother's womb. <sup>2</sup> |    |
|    | Almost had I gone down to the grave,                         | 7  |
|    | But thou, in thy lovingkindness, heldest me back.            |    |
|    | My mouth shall be filled with thy praise,                    | 8  |
| 10 | * * * * *  |    |
|    | That unto thy glory I may chant hymns,                       |    |
|    | Unto thy splendour in the great assembly.                    |    |
|    | Cast me not away in the time of old age,                     | 9  |
|    | Now that my strength fails forsake me not.                   |    |
|    | For against me mine enemies form a wily plot,                | 10 |
|    | Those who lay wait for my soul take counsel, <sup>3</sup>    |    |
|    | 'God has forsaken him, set on,                               | 11 |
|    | Seize him, for there is none to rescue.' <sup>4</sup>        |    |
|    | As for me, I trust in Yahwè,                                 | 14 |
| 20 | And stay myself on my God.                                   |    |
|    | My mouth shall tell the glad news of thy righteous           |    |
|    | dealing,   | 15 |
|    | Of thy deliverance in the great assembly.                    |    |
|    | I will abundantly utter thy might, O Yahwè !                 | 16 |
|    | I will celebrate thy righteousness and thy glory.            |    |
|    | Thou <sup>5</sup> hast trained me from my youth,             | 17 |
|    | To this day I make known thy wonders ;                       |    |

<sup>1</sup> O Lord.<sup>2</sup> In thee is my hope continually.<sup>3</sup> Together, saying.

<sup>4</sup> O Yahwè ! be not far from me. My God ! hasten to help me. Be they put to shame and dishonour who oppose my soul. Be they covered with contumely and disgrace who seek my hurt (*zv.* 12 f.).

<sup>5</sup> O God.

So then in the time of old age and gray hairs, 18  
 O Yahwè ! do not thou forsake me,  
 Until I can make known thine arm to the assembly,  
 30 To the generation of thy servants thy might.

\* \* \* \* \*

And thy righteousness, O Yahwè ! to the height. 19  
 \* \* thou hast done great things ;  
 O Yahwè ! who is like thee ?  
 Many troubles hast thou made me see, 20  
 But now thou wilt comfort me again.

From the lowest parts of the earth thou wilt bring  
 me up,  
 From depths of water wilt thou draw me. 21  
 I will thank thee among the peoples, O Yahwè ! 22  
 40 With the sound of the harp I will praise thy faithfulness ;  
 I will chant hymns to thee with the lyre,  
 The Holy One of Israel \* \*

My lips will sing for joy unto thee, 23  
 And my soul which thou hast set free.  
 Yea, in the great assembly my tongue 24  
 Will sing of thy righteousness, [O Yahwè !]  
 Because [those that opposed my soul] are put to shame,  
 Because those that sought my hurt are abashed.

5 f. Cp. xxii. 10.—7 f. Cp. xciv.  
 17, xxxviii. 17.—12. Cp. xxii. 26, xl.  
 11.—13. So *l.* 27. Cp. Isa. xli. 4 (of  
 the people of Israel).—27. שִׁיבָה ;

so Isa. *l.c.*, Hos. vii. 9.—30. Cp. cii.  
 19b.—31 f. Cp. xxxv. 6.—34. Cp.  
 xxxv. 10, lxxxvi. 8.—37. תַּח' הָאָרֶץ ;  
*i.e.* the underworld (see crit. n.).

*Critical Notes.* 2. M חוֹמִין, acc. to Ges. *Thes.*, = חֲמוּץ Isa. i. 17.  
 Probably both חוֹמִין and חֲמוּץ should be חֲמִס, which Herz replaces  
 here. Cp. G ἀδικούντος ; T חֲטוֹף.

6. M גְּנִי. Read מַחֲסִי (see on גַּחִי, xxii. 10). G (B N R\*) μου εἰ  
 σκεπαστής ; cp. G lxi. 5, σκεπασθήσομαι = אֲחֹסֶה. G (R\*) εἰ ὁ ὑπερασπιστής  
 μου = מַעֲנִי, an easy corruption of מַחֲסִי. Σ σὺ ἐπεῖδές με. For closing  
 words of v. 6 see next note.

7 f. M כְּמוֹפֶת הַיָּתִי לְרַבִּים. Who are the 'many'? and why is  
 the speaker a 'prodigy' or 'warning' to them? Duhm's answer (see  
 introd.) depends on the correctness of his view of v. 15b (which is

corrupt). Beer thinks 'כ' can mean here 'a riddle' (for the heathen and for bad Jews). But surely we should emend, כְּמַעֲט יִרְדְּתִי לְקָכָר. The closing words of *v.* 6, בָּךְ תְּהַלְלֵתִי תָמִיד, are a variant to כְּמוֹפֶת הַיָּתִי—another attempt to make sense of a half illegible passage.—M וְאַתָּה מַחְסִיעֵנִי. A conventional tag. The editor drew together the legible fragments of an indistinct passage. Read וְאַתָּה חֲשַׁכְתָּנִי וְאַתָּה בְּחֹסְדֶךָ. מ in מחסי = ני. עו comes from חס. Some letters fell out. Surely the couplet gains greatly. Cp. Isa. xxxviii. 17.

10 ff. Parallelism requires something like וְלֹךְ תִּרְנְנָה שְׁפָתַי (cp. *l.* 28). Insert לְמַעַן אֲזַמֵּר כְּבוֹדְךָ (following G<sup>B s c. a</sup>), with B<sub>1</sub>. [and now Du.].—M בְּלִדְיוֹם. Read בְּקֹהֶל רָב (see on xxxv. 18). So *ll.* 22, 45 ; lxix. 20.

15 ff. M לִי אֱוִיבִי ; very weak ! Read עָלַי גִּו' (cp. *l.* 28). Insert אֲרָבוּ. Lag.,—Omit and לאמר (metre).—In the insertion (*vv.* 12 f.) קר. הוֹשֵׁה is to be preferred to Kt. הִישֵׁה, and יִכְלֹ should be יִכְלָמוּ (G<sup>R</sup>, S, a few MSS., Ol., Hu., Dy. &c.). Cp. xxxv. 4, 26, xl. 15.

19 f. Most unsatisfactory in M. First, וְאַנִּי תָמִיד אֵיחָל. תָּמִיד here, as often, is evidently corrupt. Read not improbably וְהוֹסֵפְתִּי עַל־כָּל תְּהַלְלָתְךָ. Next, אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה and (cp. *l.* 40, and on lxviii. 25) אֱלֹהִים are very liable to corruption. For the change of the verb cp. xxii. 11a (נִסְמַכְתִּי) has become

21 f. M יִסְפֵּר. Read אֲבִסֵּר (xl. 10).—M בְּלִדְיוֹם. See on *l.* 12. Verse 15 in M closes with כִּי לֹא יִדְעֵתִי סְפָרוֹת. The vss. presuppose these consonants, but fail to make any good sense of them ; J's *non cognovi literaturas* is delightful. The moderns either render, 'I know not the numbers (thereof),' or else, like Wellh., despair. [Duhm, however, 'die Schriften' ; see introd.] The origin of the clause, however, can probably be determined. It is a second attempt of an editor to read the indistinct words which ought to be read רַב תְּשׁוּעָתְךָ

23. M אֲבֹא בְּנִבְרוֹת. Instead of going to the Arabic Lexicon for a parallel idiom, read with Gr. אֲבִיעַ בְּנִבְרָתְךָ (cp. cxlv. 7). The three ב so near together are suspicious. Against the plural form (M) note that the vss. imply the singular. See also *l.* 30. Omit יְהוָה = אֲדָנִי.

24. M לְבָרְךָ, superfluous. Read וּכְבֹּדְךָ ל. ל is a development of ' dropped out before ב. Cp. cxlv. 11 f. (כְּבוֹד and גְּבוּרָה parallel).

27. M עַד; note the two Paseḵs. Read עַת (see *l.* 13).—29 f. M לָדוֹר לְכָל. לָדוֹר, as elsewhere (*e.g.* *ll.* 12, 45) comes from קָהַל, and יָבוֹא from עָבַדְךָ (see on xxii. 31). Read therefore לְקָהַל (end of *l.* 29), and לָדוֹר עָבַדְךָ. To omit לְכָל, with S, Bā., Beer, Cobl., is inadequate. G πάσῃ τῇ γενεᾷ, *i.e.* לְכָל-הַדּוֹר (so Du.).

31. Insert perhaps יְהוָה חֲסִדְךָ עַד-שָׁמַיִם (xxxv. 6).—33. אֲשֶׁר here, as in *v.* 20 (*l.* 35), seems to be an editorial patch, unless indeed it be a corruption of לְאַרְצֶךָ. G 'A S J make 'נ אֲשֶׁר the subject to עֲדִמְרוּם!—35 ff. Thrice K<sup>r</sup>. is preferable to Kt. Almost all vss. agree. Though J begins with *mihī*, it continues with *nos*; 'A gives the first person throughout. Omit אֲשֶׁר (see last note).—M וְרָעוֹת, influenced by רַבּוֹת? Read probably וְעֵתָה; sense and metre gain. ה and ר are often confounded.—M תִּשׁוּב תַּחֲנִי. Later on we find the variant תִּשׁוּב תִּנְחַמְנִי. No doubt the right reading is תִּנְחַמְנִי; G J S do not support תִּסָּב.—M וּמִתְהוֹמוֹת הָאָרֶץ, an unexampled phrase. Read perhaps מִתְהוֹמוֹת הָאָרֶץ (Isa. xlv. 23, and (?) Ps. lxiii. 10, cxxxix. 15. [So I find already Lagarde and Duhm; Olshausen too makes the two phrases synonymous.] As *l.* 38 וְתִכְשְׁנִי מִפְּעַמְקֵי מַיִם (cp. xviii. 17), is a possible and suitable reading. תִּסָּב may be latent in תִּנְחַמְנִי, and מַיִם in מִנִּי (relic of מִנִּי). This assumes that תִּסָּב does double duty; such phenomena are not uncommon. Cp. lxix. 3, 15, and note Paseḵ after אֲנִי גַם. M's תִּרְבֵּנִי גְדֻלָּתִי (G [ἐπλεόνασας τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου]) is probably from רַבּוֹת וְגְדֻלּוֹת (corresponding to רַבּוֹת וְרָעוֹת in *v.* 20).

39 f. After אֲדֹכְךָ insert יְהוָה בְּעַפְיָם; so Bā., Beer, Roy (p. 45); G (Lucian) has ἐν λαοῖς κύριε. [So now We., *Skizzen*.]—For בְּלִי read קוֹל; cp. xlvii. 6. For אֲלֹהֵי read אֱהִי (cp. on *l.* 19 f.).—42. Insert perhaps וְנִגְאָלוֹ (Isa. xli. 14, &c.).—45. M בְּלִדְהוּם. See on *l.* 12.—46 f. Insert יְהוָה and שְׁמִנִי נִפְשִׁי (metre).

## PSALM LXXII.

**TRIMETERS.** Predictions of the happy and beneficent reign of the 'king' or the 'king's son,' *i.e.* the Messiah, the son of David. The psalm should be read in close connection with Ps. xlv., and part of what has been said on that psalm is again applicable here. In both psalms the Messiah is represented as a second Solomon. Two points may be specially mentioned here. 1. An initial act of judgment on the part of Yahwè is desired as the preliminary to the rule of the ideal king. And 2. though the royal personage addressed is distinguished from the *'aniyyin* and from the people, the closing stanza shows by its allusion to Gen. xii. 2, 3, xxii. 18,



xxvi. 4, that the Messiah is but the leader and representative of Yahwè's people. In short, as was noticed on Ps. xlv., there is very little reality in the conception of the Messiah as set forth in the psalms. It was so long since there had been a native Israelitish king that the Messianic hope in the post-exilic pre-Maccabæan period could not have much vitality.

Ps. lxxii. is also parallel to the well-known Messianic passage in Zech. ix. (vv. 9, 10). It is true that Ps. lxxii. 7b, 8, is an interpolation suggested by that prophecy, but the interpolator displayed a sound insight into the mutual affinity of both passages. He was also right in his belief that the king referred to was the Messiah, and not an imaginative representative of the pious community of Israel. We may also compare the fine Messianic prophecies in Isa. ix. and xi., which, as has been shown, are of post-exilic origin.

According to Grätz, the hero of Ps. lxxii. is the young prince Hezekiah, and the psalm expresses the hopes and vaticinations of the devout Levites, who, as he thinks, were the '*anāvim* (or '*anīyyim*'), 'the meek and lowly ones,' so often referred to in the psalms; he compares Isa. xiv. 30, 32, which, however, is in a post-exilic passage (see Marti); Hitzig, Reuss, and formerly the present writer (*OP*, 144 ff., 155) thought of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and really, if the present text of v. 15 is on the whole correct, and if a historical king is desired, it is difficult not to be attracted towards this hypothesis. Duhm, it is true, prefers some Asmonæan king, and Weissmann ('Der 72 Ps. kritisch erläutert u. übersetzt,' *Jüd. Literaturblatt*, 1886, pp. 20-22) even selects Queen Salome. But a Maccabæan psalm in the second book of the psalms is not to be expected. Duhm is also of opinion that Ps. lxxii. was originally without vv. 5-11, which contain 'wishes presupposing the Messianic eschatology.' This is an extension of Giesebrecht's and Bähgen's view that vv. 8-11, which 'interrupt the connexion,' are a later interpolation, and that the rest of the psalm was a glorification of some Israelitish king.

It would seem that a keener criticism of the text removes the basis of all these theories, and that the Messianic interpretation of the Targum is correct. Cp. Stade, *Zt. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, ii. 386 (= *Akad. Reden*, 53). The doxology in vv. 18 f. closes the second book of the Psalms. See Introduction.

*Of Salmah (or, Ishmael).*

1

1 O Yahwè! display thy judgments for the king,  
Thy righteous acts for the king's son!  
He will rule thy people with righteousness,  
Thy sufferers with justice.

2

Thy mountains will bear welfare,  
And the hills righteousness;<sup>1</sup>

3

He will do justice to the sufferers of thy people,  
He will succour the race of the poor.

4

He will crush the folk of Cusham,  
10 And destroy the race of Jerahmeel;

5

He will bring down Maacath and Amalek,  
Those of Rehoboth and of Zarephath.<sup>2</sup>

6

<sup>1</sup> Righteousness will flourish in the land (v. 7a).

<sup>2</sup> He will bring down Ishmael and Jerahmeel, | From the river to the utmost parts of the land (vv. 7b, 8).

- Before him the Miṣrites will bend the knee, 9  
 The Arabians will lick the dust ;  
 The Asshurites<sup>1</sup> will bring gifts,<sup>2</sup> 10  
 Those of Sheba<sup>3</sup> will offer gold.<sup>4</sup>  
 He will snatch the needy from the oppressor, 12  
 The sufferer who has none to help him ;  
 He will feel for the wretched, the needy, 13  
 20 The lives of the innocent he will save.  
 From Maacath<sup>5</sup> he will deliver their souls, 14  
 Precious will their blood be in his sight ;  
 • He will rescue his servants from Edom, 15  
 He will deliver them from those of Jerahmeel.  
 Justice will revive in the land, 16  
 Like the pine of the mountains will it strike root ;  
 Like the cedar in Lebanon will it spring up,  
 And flourish like the wild herbage.  
 For ever let him be blessed, 17  
 30 Before thee let his name endure ;  
 Let all kindreds bless themselves by him,  
 Let all nations call him happy.

*Doxology.*

- Blessed be Yahwè, Israel's God, 18  
 Who alone does wondrous things ;  
 And blessed be his glorious name for ever, 19  
 And let the whole earth be full of his glory. Amen, Amen.

*Subscription.*

End of the praise-songs of David, son of Jesse.

1 f. **Display thy judgments,** 'spirit of judgment' is substituted for &c. Most render יָדָן, 'give,' and 'spirit of wisdom.' But the phrase suppose this to be a prayer for the 'give thy judgments,' or, as some prefer 'spirit of wisdom,' the primary object to read, 'thy judgment,' is not very of this being to make the king an able natural. In lxxxvi. 16, 'give thy and righteous judge (1 K. iii. 28, Isa. strength' (or 'thy help'?) means xi. 2 f.); indeed, in Isa. xxviii. 6, 'display thy strength in act' (parallel

<sup>1</sup> Jerahmeelites.

<sup>2</sup> That is, one will give him of the gold of Sheba (v. 15a).

<sup>3</sup> And Seba.

<sup>4</sup> All kings will do homage unto him, | all nations will serve him (v. 11).

<sup>5</sup> And from Cushan.

'deliver'). Perhaps the psalmist means 'perform judicial acts,' or (*l. 2*) 'acts of righteousness' (1 S. xii. 7).—*The king's son*. A phrase suggested by the coronation of Solomon during David's lifetime.

3 f. The connexion is, 'Do thou, O Yahwè! interpose for Israel's expected ideal king, for he will answer all the high requirements which thou wilt make. His only aims will be justice and the national welfare.'—*Thy sufferers*. Cp. *l. 7*, 'the sufferers of (*i.e.* constituting) thy people.' 'Aniyyim is a title for the pious community as a whole (cp. ix. 13, lxviii. 11).

5 f. Cp. lxxv. 11, Isa. xlv. 8.—9 ff. See ii. 9, xviii. 38 ff., lxviii. 22 (corr. texts). To understand these passages, read Lam. v. and Obadiah. See crit. notes.

12. The gloss which forms *vv. 7b, 8*, does not describe the world-wide rule of the Messiah (any more than ii. 8, Zech. ix. 10 do); the conquest and absorption of the troublesome N. Arabian border-land is referred to. See crit. note, and cp. Sirach xlv. 21.

14. **Lick the dust.** To 'kiss the ground' was both in Egypt and in Assyria an expression for the deepest obeisance; the parallel phrase 'to eat the dust' in Assyrian meant the utmost

conceivable humiliation (Winckler, *Altor. Forsch.*, i. 291).

15 f. Cp. xviii., *ll. 101-104*, lxvii.<sup>(2)</sup>, *ll. 26-29*.

17-20. Virtually equivalent to *ll. 7, 8*. The poet felt that to make the frequent repetition of the N. Arabian ethnic names less glaring, it was desirable to repeat the reference to the compassionateness of the king, who had to crush the oppressors in order to deliver the oppressed and to save them from a renewal of their miseries.

22. Cp. on cxvi. 15. *Precious*, *i.e.* too precious to be given up to violent men—אַנְשֵׁי דָמִים, cxxxix. 19.

23 f. Alluding to the captivity of Jews in Edom (see lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, *ll. 6 f.*, cxxxvii., corr. texts). The removal of the reference to intercession for the king (see crit. note) has important critical consequences. See introd.

25 ff. A fine passage if it were not so plainly imitative. For the quatrain as here restored, cp. Isa. xxvii. 6 (פָּרַח = תְּנוּבָה, יִצִּיץ, יִשְׂרָשׁ), Hos. xiv. 5 f., Ps. xcii. 8, 13. Cp. also *Enc. Bib.*, 'Cedar,' 'Fir.'—Doxology, *l. 4*. Taken from Num. xiv. 21. See crit. note.

*Critical Notes.* 1. מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ. G S T J מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ; so Gr., Bā., We., Du. Plausible, cp. on xxxvi. 7b. See, however, exeg. note.—In *l. 2* read probably צִדְקַתֶּיךָ (cii. 6).

5 ff. M לָעַם. Omit (לֹאם dittographed).—M בְּצִדְקָה. Read הַ The ב came in through בְּצִדֵּק in *v. 2a*.—Read הַ

9 f. At first sight one might suppose M's וִידְכָא עוֹשֵׁק to be a corrupt duplication of the opening words of *v. 5*. It is clear, however, that G (καὶ σὺμπορευεῖ) represents a variant וִיאָרִיךְ (cp. Eccles. vii. 15), which Lag., Bā., Brüll (*Jahrb. f. jüd. Gesch. u. Lit.* 1885, p. 71), Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, and Now., prefer to M's יִירָאֶיךָ. Certainly יִירָאֹךְ עִם שֶׁמֶשׁ is difficult; is the object God or the king? Gr. and (in ignorance of Gr.) We. would read יִירָאוּהוּ. This cannot be right. 'They shall fear him,' is not tolerable, wedged in between couplets in which the subject of the verbs is, not the Israelites, but the Israelitish king, while Grätz's rendering 'that they may revere him (*i.e.* the king)' is a mere makeshift. Then, is Lagarde to be followed? But who can say that the statement, 'he shall live as long as the sun endures,' is probable either between *v. 4* and *v. 6*, or even

(if we follow Duhm, and regard *vv.* 5—11 as a Messianic interpolation) as a prefix to *vv.* 7—11? A statement of the king's eternity (cp. 'æternitas tua,' Plin. *Ep.* x. 87, addressed to Trajan) would come naturally either at the beginning or at the end (cp. *v.* 17) of the psalm, not—even if Duhm's view were correct—in the middle. If **וַיֵּאָרִיךְ** be adopted, we ought to regard the distich (*v.* 5) as a variant to *v.* 17, and therefore to remove it to the margin as a note on *v.* 17. Another critical course must therefore be taken. Sometimes **שָׁמַשׁ** is found to represent **נֶשֶׁם** (see e.g. lxxiv. 16, cxxi. 6, and the place-name which passes as Beth-shemesh, cp. also **סוֹס** for **כּוֹשׁ**, Isa. lxvi. 20, &c.). This reading will suit perfectly, if we point **עָם**, and further adopt the reading **יִדְכָּא** instead of **וַיֵּאָרִיךְ** or **יֵאָרִיךְ**. In a psalm which contains so many names of countries, we cannot be surprised to find the name of such an important N. Arabian people as Cush or Cusham, and the anticipation that Cush shall be broken to pieces is paralleled by the statement in lxxxix. 11a (corr. text). Thus **יִדְכָּא עוֹשֶׁק** is a variant to **וַיֵּאָרִיךְ עַם-שָׁמַשׁ**, which enables us to restore one important word with absolute correctness. **עוֹשֶׁק**, as we can now see, represents **עַם כּוֹשׁ**. It should be added that **שָׁמַשׁ** represents not only **כּוֹשׁ** but also the verb required for *l.* 10 (= *v.* 5b), viz. **יִשְׁמִיד**, which fell out through its containing the letters **שִׁמ** which enter into **שָׁמַשׁ**. The last two letters of **יִשְׁמִיד** became **וּל**, and were combined with **פָּנִי** (miswritten for **בָּנִי**) to make **לִפְנֵי יָרַח** = **יָרַח** = 'Jerah' in Gen. x. 26). Read therefore,—

**יִדְכָּא עַם כּוֹשׁ**  
**וַיִּשְׁמִיד בָּנֵי יִרְחָמָאֵל**

11. MG **יֵרֵד דִּוְרִים**. A careless scribe's three attempts to write **וַיֵּרֵד**.—M **פִּמְטֵר עֲלֵגֵנָּה**. According to Duhm, this is Messianic. 'The verse says of the Messiah the same that in Hos. vi. 3b is said of Yahwè.' There, however, the verb is **יָבוֹא**; here it is **יֵרֵד**. Is the Messiah anywhere said to 'come down'? And what of **גֵּנָּה**? It is usual to render 'mown grass,' and to compare Am. vii. 1; G 3 J, however, render *πίσκον*, *vellus*. See also G. Hoffmann, *ZATW*, 1883; p. 117, who is controverted by Hupf.-Nowack, ii. 201. On the whole question see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Mowings.' The text (here and in Am., *l.c.*) is corrupt. In this context we surely require ethnic names. Read probably **מַעֲכָת וַעֲמִלָּק**. The first **ע** dropped out, and **ת** became **ט**. **ק** became **ג**, and a mutilated Aramaic **כּ** became an Aramaic **ז**. See exeg. note.

12. First, as to **זְרִיף**. The word is not at all a probable one. It occurs once (= 'overflow') in post-Biblical literature (*Yoma*, 87a); the verb **זְרִיף** is also found (Midr. on Cant. i. 3). J. Kennedy (*Heb. Synonyms*, 111) groups **זְרִיף** with **סִנְרִיר** (Prov. xxvii. 15), but this word is also an improbable one; read **שְׁעִירִים** or **רְסִיסִים** (cp. on civ. 13).

Since 'like showers, an overflow (on) the land' is impossible, Hu., Bi., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, read **זָרִיף**, and Duhm **זָרְפוּ** (G *στρέφουσαι*), but such Aramaic coinages are very improbable. Next, as to the entire line. If **זָרִיף** is corrupt, how can we safely trust **כְּרִיבִים** (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Rain') and **אָרֶץ**? As in *l.* 11, we expect, not a figure from nature, but ethnic names (cp. on **רִבִּיִּים**, *lxv.* 11). It is not the gentle descent of rain but the destruction of hostile powers that we expect in this context. **אָרֶץ** might, as elsewhere, come from **מָצָר**. More probably, however, **זָרִיף** and **וְצִרְפָּתִים** should be taken together, and the line should be read **וְצִרְפָּתִים** which is amply sufficient to form a trimeter.

*Glosses.* Verses 7, 8 are entirely composed of glosses, and three small glosses occur in *v.* 10. To understand the former, the text of *v.* 7, 8 must be closely examined. That **צֶדֶק** should be **צֶדֶק** (G S J; 3 MSS. Kenn.; Secker, Street, Kr., Lag., Gr., We., Du.) few will doubt. **בִּימִי** has escaped criticism. It is however otiose, whereas 'in the land,' or the like, is to be expected. Verses 7, 8, as we shall see, are so deeply corrupt that it is reasonable to look for the word which comes nearest to **בִּימִי**, and to emend accordingly. The right word is **בְּאֶדְמָה** (cp. *lxxxv.* 12). We next ask, Is *v.* 7<sup>b</sup> correct in its present form? **רֵב שְׁלוֹם** is suspicious; **רֵב** is otiose with **יִפְרַח**. Suspicious again is **עֲדִבְלֵי יֶרֶחַ**; why should the flourishing of prosperity have a term set to it? Parallel passages in *v.* 5 and 17 can be shown to be corrupt, and in one of these verses **יֶרֶחַ** is a mutilated form of **יִרְחֵמָל**. The analogy of Zech. ix. 10 (to be referred to again) warrants us in reading (for *v.* 7<sup>b</sup>), **וְיִרִיד יִשְׁמְעָל**, **וְיִרְחֵמָל**. Now we turn to *v.* 8. That there is an allusion to Zech. ix. 10, has long ago been noticed. It has not, however, been observed that Zech. ix. is a highly corrupt section, and that in its original form it related throughout, not to Damascus, Tyre, Philistia, Greece, but to the N. Arabian neighbours of the Jews (see *Crit. Biblica*, 186). Omitting the opening words, Zech. ix. 10 should almost certainly run thus,—**וְהִכְרִית וְקָשֶׁת יִרְחֵמָל וְהוֹרִיד יִשְׁמְעָל כִּנְהָר עַד־אֶפְסֵי אֲרָץ**. It now becomes probable that *v.* 8 should run—**וְיִרִיד יִרְחֵמָל מִנְהַר עַד־**, **אֶפְסֵי אֲרָץ**, and that the first two words should be expanded by the insertion of **וְיִשְׁמְעָל**; *iv.* 8 and Zech. ix. 10 have in fact been harmonized. On the glosses in *v.* 11 see below.

13. M **צִיִּים**. Ol., Dy., Bi., Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We., Du., read **צָרִים**. But we need an ethnic name. G gives *Aithiopes*, but this, as *lxxiv.* 14 (*τοῖς Αἰθίοψι* = **לְצִיִּים**) shows, is a paraphrase, not a translation. Read **מְצָרִים**.—14. M **וְאִבְיוּ**. Read **וְעֶרְבִים**.—15. M G's text is evidently too long, nor is either 'Tarshish' or 'the coast-lands' appropriate here; 'kings'

too is unexpected. The remedies are suggested by experience elsewhere. Read **יִרְחֲמָאִים וְאֲשׁוּרִים מְנַחֵה יֹשִׁיבוּ**, but here **יִרְחֲמָאִים** may be omitted as an incorrect variant to **וְאֲשׁ**.—16. Omit **וְסָבָא** as an interpolation, read **שְׂבָאִים**, and for **אֲשַׁחַר חֶרֶץ** read **אֲשַׁחַר חָרִץ** (חרץ, written 'חר, fell out); **אֲשׁ** a gloss on **תִּרְשִׁישׁ אֲשַׁחַר**. **אֲשַׁחַר** occurs again in Ezek. xxvii. 15, but read **סַחֲרִיךְ**. Omit **מַלְכִי** (dittographed).

*Gloss.* In *v.* 11 note **מַלְכִים**, presupposing the faulty reading **מַלְכִי** in *v.* 10. The influence of lxviii.<sup>(2)</sup>, ll. 26 f. may also be suspected.

17. M **שׁ T מְשׁוּעַ**. Read **מְעֻשׁ [ק]**. G S J **מְשׁוּעַ** (Isa. xxxii. 5, Job xxxiv. 19); less probable, though still defensible (cp. Sirach xiii. 18).—20. M **אֲבִיּוֹנִים**. Parallelism requires **נְקִיִּים**; cp. Jer. ii. 34, where **אֲבִיּוֹנִים** and **נְקִיִּים** are variants.—21. M G **וּמִחָמָם**; too vague, also too long. **תוֹךְ** is an unusual form (though some read it in x. 7, lv 12). **תוֹךְ** and **תָּךְ**, however, are equally uncertain (cp. on x. 7, lv. 12), and **תַּכְכִּים** in Prov. xxix. 13 is at any rate doubtful. It is an ethnic that we expect here. We may take our choice between **מִעֵבֶת**, which is probably represented by **תוֹךְ**, and **כַּשָּׁם** (see on xviii. l. 98), which has become **חַמֵּס**. 'Cusham' seems to be a gloss on **מִעֵבֶת**.

*Gloss.* In *v.* 15 **וַיְחִי** is a variant to **יְהִי** in *v.* 16 (see on l. 25). The next words are a paraphrase of *v.* 10b (l. 16). **מִזֵּהָב** is important as showing that the glossator understood the meaning of the now misread second part of *v.* 10.

23 f. G J give plural verbs, which Duhm prefers, but wrongly. The passage is deeply corrupt, though it has now become easy to correct it. For **וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל וְגו'** read **וַיִּפְלִיט עֲבָדָיו מֵאֲדָוָה**, and for **כִּלְדָּיו וְגו'** read **כִּלְדָּיו וְגו'** frequently conceal different words.

25. M **בְּאַרְצָן יְהִי פֶסֶת בֵּר**. **יְהִי פֶסֶת** is generally rendered *expansio*, *diffusio*, but the philological basis is insecure. **שׁ** gives *ἔλχος* = **פֶּסַעַ** in Targ. and Talm. (Herz). *G* *στήριγμα*; *ἄπρου* seems to have fallen out; *T* has **לְחֵמָה סַעִיד**. Is this a pure guess? It hardly presupposes **מִשְׁעֵנָה**. Lag., Gr., Che.<sup>(1)</sup>, We., **שִׁפְעָת** (cp. Job xxii. 11). Quite independently, Herz and Duhm have proposed **מִסֵּת** (an Aramaism). But as the next words in *M* are, as Duhm says, 'mere nonsense,' we may well look further for the truth. *Pasek* warns us against **בֵּר**, which is in fact miswritten for **בְּאַרְצָן**. For **פֶּסֶת** read probably **מִשְׁפָּט** (cp. Isa. xxxii. 16); **יְהִי** should be **יְחִי** (*v.* 15, **וַיְחִי**).

26. The prevalent error respecting **בֵּר** generally results in placing corn-fields on the top of the mountains. To avoid this *W F* bring out

this rendering, 'The mountain-tops rustle like a Lebanon of fruit'; certainly very hyperbolic indeed! **ירעש**, 'rustle,' would be strange anywhere (though note Del.'s Arabic parallel). In such an unadorned poem as Ps. lxxii. it is inconceivable. *G* *ὑπερπαρθέσεται ὑπὲρ τὸν Λιβ., i.e.* **יִנְשֵׂא מִלְּבָנוֹן**—a pure conjecture. Read **יִשְׂרֵשׁ**; the corruption was partly caused by the proximity of **בראש** (cp. Ewald, 'es gipfle,' from **ראש**!). For **בראש** read **כַּבְּבוֹשׁ**. See exeg. note.

27 f. *M*'s **כַּלְבָּנוֹן פָּרִי** is too short for a line; **כָּאָרֹז** must have fallen out, owing to the resemblance of **ארז** to **ירעש**. Read **כָּאָרֹז בַּלְבָּנוֹן** **וְצִיֹן כְּעֶשֶׂב** **וְצִיֹן מַעִיר וְנֹר** (xcii. 13).—*M* **וְצִיֹן מַעִיר וְנֹר**. Read certainly **וְצִיֹן כְּעֶשֶׂב** **וְצִיֹן מַעִיר** (though *G* read it) as a corruption of **יערים**, which is manifestly a variant to **הרים** (l. 26).

29. *M* **שְׁמוֹ**, followed by Pasek. *G*, however, has *ἔστω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, where, as Duhm points out, *τὸ ὄν. αὐτ.* (*i.e.* **שְׁמוֹ**) is a correction based on *M*, and *εὐλογ.* represents the true reading **בְּרִיָּה**.—30. In **לִפְנֵי־שָׁמֶשׁ** (*M G*) **שָׁמֶשׁ** is but a distortion of **שְׁמוֹ** (written too soon). Read **לִפְנֵיָהּ**. Next as to **יָנִין**. The *Kr.* is **יָנוֹן**, which is not Niphal of **נָיַן** (?), but a corruption of **יָבוֹן** (so *G J S* [?] *T* [?]; 1 *MS. de R.*). So Street, *Bä.* (?). *Ges.-Bu.* (pp. 526a, 173a), however, infers from *G*'s *διαμενεῖ* the reading **יָדוֹן**, but can we rely for this on *M*'s text of Gen. vi. 3? Duhm, **יָנִיץ**, an improbable Aramaism.—31. A parallel to **כָּל־גִּוִּים** is wanting. Insert **כָּל־מִשְׁפָּחוֹת** (*Bi.*); nearly so Street, *Bä.*, *Du.*, following *G*'s *πάντα αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*.

Doxology, l. 4. Read **וְיִמְלֹא**, Geiger, Kautzsch (*Ges.*<sup>(26)</sup>, § 121c), following *G Num.* xiv. 21 (*ἐμπλήσει*).

*Subscription.* *M* **תַּפְּלוֹת**. *G* *οἱ ὕμνοι αὐτοῦ*. Read **תַּהֲלוֹת** (*Kr.*, *Gr.*, *Abbott*). So perhaps in *Hab.* iii. 1. read **תַּהֲלָה**.

## PSALM LXXIII.

**TRIMETERS.** A psalm of struggling but victorious faith. A slight rearrangement of stanzas 8–11 greatly improves the effect. The psalm opens with a statement of the finally attained conviction that in spite of appearances Yahwe's favour is for Israel and his wrath for Israel's foes (ll. 1, 2). Then begins a most affecting description of a period of mental agony. The speaker says that for a moment he had fallen headlong into a 'pit' (l. 4). He saw a body of persons enjoying an uninterrupted course of prosperity (ll. 5–10), and as a consequence so possessed by pride that they stopped at no blasphemy, and as it were drank up treason (ll. 11–20). The peoples to which they belonged were of N. Arabia; Arabians, Cushites, Jerahmeelites, Ishmaelites are the names given to them. In ll. 23 f., however, they are simply called 'the wicked' and 'the unrighteous'; we may perhaps infer that they were not invaders, but permanent settlers, and that lawless

Jews had joined them. Even over the pious community—the true Israel—a wave of scepticism passed at the sight of such an apparent failure of retribution. Some of its members actually questioned God's capacity of discernment, and pronounced the moral discipline to which they had subjected themselves of no avail (*ll.* 21–28), and since the words used are, 'my feet gave way' (*l.* 3), and 'I said' (*l.* 21), we may conclude that among those whose faith gave way were many of the leading Jews. It was with the deepest pain that they became unbelievers, but for a time they were (from the Hebrew point of view) no better than atheists, for they 'denied' God's lovingkindness and faithfulness, on which hitherto they had rested their whole religion. Looking back upon this, they saw how foolish they had been, and recognized that they had missed the only possible explanation of the facts, viz. that when God's time (the Messianic judgment) has come the wicked will be suddenly swept away like grass (*cp.* xcii. 8?). Pious Israel recovered its balance, and the joyous consciousness of the divine Companion returned to it. The path on which Israel walks is the path to glory. No inward temptation nor outward misfortune can cause him to stumble. He longs for Yahwè—the peerless God—to reveal himself as Israel's eternal portion. No more will he give way to doubt; the denial of God leads to ruin. *Cp. Jewish Religious Life*, 238–240, 246 f.

There is a close parallelism between this psalm and xlix., where, however, there is no reference to any wavering on the part of Israel, and a still closer resemblance to Pss. xxxix.<sup>(1)</sup>, xciv.<sup>(1)</sup>, and cxvi. (see introductions). Pss. xxxvii. and xcii. (see below, on *ll.* 5, 35) are also parallel. It is plain that the speaker is no individual—no Hebrew Pascal—but the community, or, at least, the 'dullards among the people,' mentioned in an explanatory passage of the parallel Ps. xciv. Smend's remark (*p.* 124) that, in spite of the apparent references to the experience of an individual, the psalm may yet have been composed for public worship, is fully justified by the revised text. The features which seem to point in an opposite direction (*vv.* 15, 17) are due to corruption of the text. (*Cp.*, however, Coblenz, pp. 176 ff.; Roy, pp. 63 f.) If so, it becomes impossible to quote this psalm as an evidence of the rising hope of personal immortality. On the basis of the traditional text, one might indeed do this; Charles thinks this justified ('Eschatology,' *Enc. Bib.*, col. 1367), and so formerly thought the present writer (*OP*, 390, 422; *Ps.*<sup>(1)</sup> on Ps. lxxiii.). Nor can we venture to say with Laue (*Comp. des B. Hiob*, 82, note) that Ps. lxxiii. is only intelligible as a Maccabæan psalm.

*Marked: of Asaph.*

- |    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    |  | I |
| I  | Surely Yahwè is good to Israel,<br>Those of Jerahmeel [he abhors].               |   |
|    | But as for me, my feet gave way ;  | 2 |
|    | As I trod, I stumbled at a pit.  | * |
|    | For I was enraged at the impious,  | 3 |
|    | I was incensed at the prosperity of the wicked ;                                 |   |
|    | For of stripes they have no experience,  | 4 |
|    | Continually they see prosperity.   |   |
|    | In the day of desolation they are safe,  | 5 |
| 10 | In the day of calamity they are not smitten :<br>Therefore pride possesses them, | 6 |
|    | With the garment of violence they clothe themselves.                             |   |
|    | They increase their strength by their iniquity,                                  | 7 |
|    | They prevail by the devices of their hearts ;                                    |   |
|    | They crush thy people, O Yahwè !   | 8 |
|    | +Even+ Arabia, Cusham, and Jerahmeel.  | • |



	The Cushites subvert thy possession,	9
	Thine inheritance the Ishmaelites break to pieces ;	
	Therefore they deny Yahwè,	10
20	And treason they swallow greedily.	
	Then I said, ' How can God have noticed anything ?	11
	Has the Most High the power to discern ?	
	Behold, the wicked prosper,	12
	The unrighteous amass wealth.	
	How vain it is to cleanse my heart,	13
	And to desire the dwelling-place of his glory,	•
	When strokes fall upon me continually,	14
	And stripes every morning.'	
	And shuddering took hold of me	
30	At the iniquity of those of Jerahmeel ;	16
	For my heart was astonished,	21
	And in my reins I was horror-stricken ;	
	I myself rejected wisdom,	15
	Thy lovingkindness and faithfulness I denied ;	
	I became a dullard, I was ignorant,	22
	I lacked discernment respecting thee,	
	Until I gave heed to the judgments of God,	17
	And discerned the future of those men :	
	How +suddenly+ calamities overtake them !	18
40	Thou castest upon them gloom +of Deathland+ !	
	How are they brought to ruin in a moment,	19
	Swept clean away are the impious ones !	
	Jerahmeel and Cusham are destroyed,	20
	The Arabians and Mişrites thou sweepest away.	
	But as for me, I rejoice evermore ;	23
	Thou hast hold of my right hand :	
	According to thy purpose thou ledest me,	24
	And makest known to me the path of glory.	
	Whom has Yahwè +for a peer+ in heaven ?	25
50	Or who upon earth is like God, my stronghold ?	
	My flesh and my heart pine for him—	26
	My Rock and my Portion for ever.	

Truly those will perish who insult thee, 27  
Every one that blasphemeth thy name thou wilt ex-  
tinguish.

But as for me, I cleave unto my God, 28  
I trust in Yahwè<sup>1</sup> my Refuge.<sup>2</sup>

1. אֵל טוֹב, less probably 'only good,' i.e. even when as now the wicked seem to be God's favourites. As in xxxix. 6, lxii. 2, &c., renderings vary. Adopting the secondary adversative sense, J gives *attamen*; Σ *πλὴν ὅντως*; Calvin *aliqui*. Marot finely 'Si est ce que Dieu est très doux.' אֵל belongs to

the whole sentence, including the statement of God's abhorrence of Jerahmeel.

—3. *My feet gave way*. As we shall see presently, it was the prevailing might of the Edomite oppressors which led a section of the pious community into grievous sin, denying Yahwè's lovingkindness and faithfulness (l. 34). Another psalmist, qualifying a similar confession which might scandalize the community, represents this 'giving way of the feet' as merely an apprehended danger. 'If I say, My foot gives way, | Thy lovingkindness, O Yahwè! holds me up.'

5. **The impious** were a continual eyesore to the pious. 'Let me put a guard on my mouth,' says one of their representatives, 'while the wicked confronts me' (xxxix. 2). Intercourse with them was a sin (xxvi. 4b, l. 18); but even to be *enraged* at them (see on xxxvii. 1, xlix. 6) was only too likely to lead to sin. Hence the need of frank declarations like the present and the parallel psalms. — 7. *Stripes*,

חֲבִירוֹת. Metaphorically, as v. 14b, xxxviii. 6; cp. Isa. i. 6, liii. 5. For the idea of ll. 7, 8, cp. Job xxi. 9, 'Their houses are prosperous, without fear, | Neither is the rod of God upon them.'

15-18. Parallel passage, xciv. 4 f.

—19. *Deny Yahwè*, as xlix. 3, 14, 17, l. 22.—20. It is treason, מַעַל, even

for Cushites to violate holy persons or things on Yahwè's land.—*Swallow greedily*. Cp. Job xxxiv. 7, '(Job) who

drinks up scorning like water.'—21-28. *Then I said*, &c. Parallel passages, xciv. 7, 'And I said, Yahwè doth not see, Jacob's God doth not observe'; x. 4, 11, 13; Job xxii. 13.—*How vain is it*, &c. Parallel passages, xxxix. 9b, cxvi. 11; Job xxi. 15, xxii. 13. In his consternation (cxvi. 11) the speaker contradicts the finest of the Hebrew psalms (e.g. xxvi.).—*To cleanse my heart*, i.e. to keep it free from the sense of guilt (cp. Prov. xx. 9).—29 ff. See crit. notes.

33-36. See introd., and crit. notes. True wisdom consists in knowing that God is a rewarder of those that seek him (xxiv. 5 f.). *A dullard*. Cp. xcii. 7 f., xciv. 12 f.—37. *The judgments of God*, i.e. how God manifests his justice in act. M, 'the sanctuaries of God,' which most, very unsuitably to the context, take to mean the temple (cp. lxxviii. 36). Some, however<sup>3</sup> (Ol., Ew., Hi., Wellh., Duhm), explain, 'God's secrets, or mysteries' (Wisd. ii. 22), the divine plans or principles of action being like the inner sanctuary of the temple, and requiring a special preliminary purification. Duhm even thinks that this peculiar phrase may refer to the Pharisean doctrine of immortality, which was at first esoteric, and only propagated with caution. The sense produced by this rendering is good, but the Hebrew has to be forced. Consequently the text must be wrong. See crit. note.—40. *Gloom (of Deathland)*. Cp. lv. 6b. The 'gloom' is that of sudden calamity; see next stanza.—42. *The impious*, as l. 5.—43 f. The renewed reference to the offending peoples by their names shows the art of the poet; stanza 11 corresponds to stanza 4. For a time Jerahmeel and Cusham, Arabia and Misrim seemed gods upon earth, and crushed Yahwè's poor without mercy. Now the retaliation arrives; Yahwè crushes his people's enemies. The traditional text is obscure and scarcely

<sup>1</sup> The Lord.

<sup>2</sup> To rehearse all thy wonders.

<sup>3</sup> So, before the moderns, Vatablus (*Crit. Sacr.*, 1660, iii. 3837).

intelligible. The editor evidently intended a parallelism of expression between חֲלוֹם and צֶלֶם. But no exegesis will succeed in producing a parallelism of thought. 'Their phantasm' (צֶלֶם) can only mean 'their semblance of life'; but 'a dream' (חֲלוֹם) has reference to the impression produced on an observer by the sudden destruction of living persons (cp. Job xx. 8). The one records an objective, the other a subjective fact. The verb תְּבוֹהָ too is most unsuitable. Men do not despise their dreams; indeed, the ancients ascribed to them a prophetic significance. Nor can Yahwè be said to 'despise' those whom he sweeps away as by a destructive flood.

45. Stanza 12 corresponds to stanza 1. Now that the speaker sees that God is just—stern to the transgressors,

but good to the upright—he can take up again the וְאֲנִי ('as for me') of l. 3, and give it a happier setting. 'As for me'—whose feet but lately gave way—'I rejoice evermore' (תְּמִיד). And then follows a striking and felicitous repetition of the substance of xvi. 7-9 and 11 (see notes).

49 f. Israel's 'goodly heritage'—to be united to the God of gods. Even now, he is conscious of this happiness, but the full enjoyment of it will be in the near Messianic future. The 'king of glory' (xxiv. 7-10) has not yet made his triumphant entrance into his sanctuary. See introd.

53. It is no vague anathema against the wicked in general. The inveterate and incorrigible enemies of Israel and Israel's religion are the objects of the speaker's wrath. Cp. xlv. 17, lxxiv. 18.

*Critical Notes.* 1. Why, inquires Duhm, should 'Israel' be mentioned as a people, when no reference is made in the sequel to non-Israelites? Besides *v. 1a* seems to be too short. Hence Schorr, Grätz, Perles, and Duhm read אֵךְ טוֹב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, and draw אֱלֹהִים over to l. 2. But the distich thus produced is not a good one, and the sequel rightly read leads us to expect a reference to non-Israelites. In lxxvi. 6 אֲבִירֵי לֵב has taken the place of יִרְחֲמָאִלִּים; it is probable that the same word should be substituted here for the traditional reading לִבְרֵי לֵבָב. A word has fallen out before 'ירח'; it is יִתְעַב, the resemblance of which to טוֹב in l. 1 may have led to the omission. Read therefore—אֵךְ טוֹב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִרְחֵה.

3 f. M נָטָי כַּמְעַט (Kt.) or נָטָיִי (Kr.). Bā. defends נָטָי. But a participial clause like this at the opening of a narrative is very unlikely. Kön. (§ 348 e β) thinks that the position of the י may be influenced by רָגַלִּי. But the words are certainly corrupt. 1. כַּמְעַט is a needless qualification; the speaker, as we shall see, had not almost, but altogether slipped. 2. It is metrically superfluous. 3. נָטָה, 'to swerve,' should be followed by מֵאֲרָח, or the like (xliv. 19). Gr., for a reason of his own, reads נָטָה, but keeps כַּמְעַט. But this word, not less than נָטָי, represents נָטָה; נָטָה, ע, נָטָה has grown out of a misplaced נָטָה. In נָטָיִי is a fragment of נָטָה; נָטָה has dropped out.—M שָׁפָה אֶשְׁרֵי (Kt.) or שָׁפָנוּ (Kr.). Kr. has very little support from MSS. Del. and Bā. defend שָׁפָה grammatically, but there is a most important previous question: • can שָׁפָה mean 'to slip'? A Latin parallel (*fundere, effundere*) is

worthless. נִכְשָׁלִי is also suspicious; nowhere else does this mean 'almost.' Read בִּפְחַת אֲשֶׁרִי.

5 f. M בְּהוֹלָלִים. Read בִּנְבָלִים (see on v. 6, lxxv. 5). The same word (נ') in another corrupt form occurs in v. 19 (l. 42).—M שְׁלֹם, אֲרָאָה. Read בְּשָׁלוֹם, אֶתְהַר (cp. on אִירָא, xlix. 6).

7 f. M חֲרָצְבוֹת. Cp. Isa. lviii. 6, where the lexicons give the Arabic sense of 'bands.' There, however, read מַעֲנֵדוֹת (and אָסִיר for רָשָׁע). In our passage read חֲבֵרוֹת. Less probably Gr., עֲצָבוֹת. G has ἀνάνευσις (ἀνανέωσις?).—M לְמוֹתָם וּבְרִיא אֵילָם. But a reference to euthanasia is out of place. Most read לָמוֹתָם (Moerlius in 1737, Street, Ewald, Hitzig, Wellh. &c.). But תָּם and בְּרִיא do not go well together. A more thorough correction is required. G ἐν τῇ θανάτῳ αὐτῶν (attached to α) καὶ στερέωμα ἐν τῇ μάστιγι αὐτῶν (וּבְנִנְעָם). Read תָּמִיד רָאִי שְׁלֹם.

9b. M בְּעֵמֶל אָנוּשׁ אֵינִימו. Strange. 'They are not in the trouble of men'! In the form אֵינִימו Kōn. (ii. 446) finds the influence of forms like אֵלִימו (ii. 5) and עֲלִימו (v. 12). Read שְׁאוֹן יִשְׁלָמו. The ל was inserted to make sense after יו had been corrupted into ע. אָנוּשׁ for שְׁאוֹן, as perhaps in Jer. xvii. 16 and Isa. xvii. 11 (see *SBOT*, Heb., pp. 90, 195, but also *Crit. Bib.*, pp. 24, 62). Read וּבִיּוֹם אֵיד וְעַם-אָדָם. (cf. Dt. xxxii. 35, Job xxi. 30).

11 f. M עֲנֵקְתָּמוּ. 'All the Vss. except T have misunderstood the word,' says Bā. Rather, all the Vss., incl. T, except G, misunderstand. Σ ἡμφίσταντο; J nutriti sunt (יִנְק / יִנְק); T עֲשֵׂרְתָּנוֹן (surrounds them). Three guesses. The modern view is also a guess. G has the true text; ἐκράτησεν αὐτούς, i.e. אֶחָזְתָּמוּ. אָחוּ became אָקָן.—M שִׁית (שִׁית has been suggested). Cf. סוֹת (from סוּוֹת, Bö.), Gen. xlix. 11. Both שִׁית and סוֹת should be corrected כְּסוֹת (so Gr., Ball in Gen.), and in Ex. xxxiv. 33 מִסּוּהָ should be מִכְסָּה. Correct שִׁית also in Prov. vii. 10. L. 12 as a whole should run thus, בְּסוֹת חָמֶם יַעֲמֹפִי-לָמוּ. So virtually Herz. If בְּסוֹת חָמֶם belong together (T and accents), יַעֲטָף has no object. Note plur. verbs in G S.

13. M יֵצֵא מִחֶלֶב עֵינָיו. G ἐξελεύσεται ὡς ἐκ στέατος ἡ ἀδικία αὐτῶν, which Suidas explains, 'With all security they will speak unrighteousness.' ἡ ἀδικ. (so S) is of course right, as Bp. Horsley, Hi., Ew. and most agree. But חֶלֶב as a mere synonym for לֶב is very doubtful; is there any reason for emphasizing insensibility here (it is otherwise in xvii. 10)?

Herz suggests, יַעֲצֵמוּ הַלֵּב בְּעֵינָמוּ. But עָצַם means to close the eyes; we hardly dare extend the reference. Better, יִיאֲמְצוּ חֵיל בְּעוּ : cf. אֲמָץ כַּח, Am. ii. 14, Nah. ii. 2, Prov. xxiv. 5.

14. M's מַשְׁבּוֹת should mean 'imaginations' (so S), but cannot be so rendered. Prov. xviii. 11 is certainly corrupt. There has been both transposition and corruption. Read perhaps יִנְבְּרוּ בְּמַחְשְׁבוֹת לִבָּם : לְבָהוֹן T.

15 f. M יִמְקוּ, an Aramaizing ἀπ. λεγ. of unsuitable sense. Note Pasek. Then follows וַיִּדְּבְרוּ בָרַע; clearly wrong. Wicked men do not 'speak concerning evil'; they speak evil, and then they act evil. • M's division of the verse too is against the Vss., except S and perhaps J (see Lagarde). The key is supplied by a parallel psalm (xciv.). Read עֲמָדָה יִדְּבָאוּ יהוה (xciv. 5a). ברע is no doubt from עָרַב (cp. בעיר, v. 20).—M עֲשֵׂק מְמָרוֹם יִדְּבָאוּ; G ἀδικίαν εἰς τὸ ὕψος (cp. S) ἐλάλησαν. For עֲשֵׂק we should expect עֲתָק, always used with דִּבֵּר (xxx. 19, lxxv. 6, xciv. 9, 1 S. ii. 3). Or we might read עֲקָשׁ (Buhl, 'for עֲקָשׁ'); cp. S BOT on Isa. xxx. 12). Both inadequate corrections. Note repeated יִדְּבָאוּ. Siegf.-Sta. remark, p. 379, 'In Ps. x. 5, lvi. 3, xcii. 9, perhaps textual error.' They might have added lxxiii. 9. Read certainly בּוֹשֵׁם יִרְחַמְאֵל (עָרַב). יִרַח is represented both by מְמָרוֹם and partly by יִדְּבָאוּ (i.e. by יִדַּב).

17 f. M שֵׁתוּ בַּשָּׁמַיִם פִּיהֶם; a strange phrase, however interpreted! The editor has cleverly made an external parallelism between בַּשָּׁמַיִם in α and בָּאָרֶץ in δ. But xciv. 5b supplies the true key, which also solves the problem of the next line, where the tongue is represented as a roving brigand (תִּהְיֶה; Lag., Now., We. מְתִהֵלָה; Tg however מַצְלֵהבָה, i.e. תִּלְהַב [Herz], or תִּלְהֵט [lxxxiii. 15]). Read II. 17 f.,—

יִרְשָׁתָּךְ כּוֹשִׁים יִהְיוּ  
שְׁמֵעָאִלִים נִחְלָתָּךְ יִרְצוּ

Observe here that יִרְשָׁתָּךְ must have been written יְרוּשָׁתָּךְ; attached itself to a misplaced fragment of יִרְחַמְאֵל (viz. יִרַח = יִדַּב).

19 f. M יָשִׁיב עֹמֵי הָלֶם לֵבָן. So Kt.; but K<sup>r</sup>. יָשׁוּב, which the Rabbis and most moderns prefer. G διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιστρέφει ὁ λαὸς μου ἐνταῦθα, i.e. יָשִׁיב עֹמֵי (cp. S). There is deep corruption. Houb., Lag., Perles יִשְׁבְּעוּ ל' לֵבָן יִשְׁבִּיעִימוּ לָחֶם; Gildemeister (ZDMG xiii. 530) יִשְׁבְּעוּ ל' לֵבָן יִשְׁבִּיעִימוּ לָחֶם. Herz, הִשְׁבִּיבוּ עָמָל. But, as the parallel psalms show, a reference to

deniers of God is to be expected. Read certainly—**לְבֹי יִכְחֹשׁוּ אֱלֹהִים** (ידוה).—M **וּמִי מָלֵא יִמְצֹו לָמוֹ**. ‘Quite obscure’ (Kautzsch). Bread (? *l.* 19) and water, the rewards of impiety? Or (apart from *l.* 19) can ‘water’ mean ‘doctrine’ (cp. *Pirke Aboth* i. 4, 11). So perhaps **Σ, καὶ διαδοχῇ** (? *διδασχῇ*) *πληρῆς*. G *καὶ ἡμέραι πλήρεις* = [**וּמִימִם מָלֵאִים**]. G **Σ J** read **יִמְצָאוּ מִים מָלֵאִים**. Herz, **וּמִלִּים יִמְצָאוּ**. Such groping is quite ineffectual. As a parallel to *l.* 19 read, **וּמִיֶּעַל יִמְצָו לָמוֹ**; cp. Isa. lxvi. 11 (**תִּכְצֹו**). See exeg. note.

21. M **וְאָמְרוּ**; G *καὶ εἶπαν*. Read certainly **וְאָמַר** (see *l.* 25); for a parallel, see on xciv. 7. G’s *καὶ εἶπα*, at the head of *v.* 13, may have been a marginal correction of *καὶ εἶπαν*.

23 f. M **אֵלֶּה**. Probably a fragment of **עוֹלִים** written by error instead of **רשעים**. M’s **וְשָׁלִי** is no doubt from **יִשְׁלִי**. G *ἰδοὺ ἀμαρτωλοὶ καὶ εὐθηνούνται*.—M **עוֹלִם**. Read **וְעוֹלִים** (very nearly so Gr.).

25 f. For G, see on *l.* 21.—In *l.* 26 the editor recast an indistinctly written passage on the model of xxvi. 6 (also corrupt). Read **וְאַחֲפִיז בְּמִשְׁכְּנִי כְּבֹדִי**. See on xxvi. 6.

27 f. M **וְאֶהְיֶה נִגְעִי**; a good construction (Kön. 239b), but against parallelism. Read **וְיֶהְיֶה נִגְעִי**.—M **וְתוֹכְהִתִּי**; G *καὶ ὁ ἔλεγχός μου*. Read **וְחִבּוּרִתִּי**. Cp. *l.* 7.

29 f. M **וְאַחֲשִׁבָהּ**, or rather, —**ן**, as some MSS. give, and as is implied by G A S J T; so Now., Bā., Kau., We., Kön. (§ 200b). The natural sequel, however, of an exclamation like that in *l.* 21—28 is not beating one’s brains to solve the intellectual problem of the prosperity of the wicked, but first a natural horror at the dreadful alternatives presented to one, and next a step forward into the untried land of denial. Cp. Job xxi. 6. So too in *l.* 30, how weak and how obscure is the traditional reading, **הִיא בְּעֵינִי עָמַל** [Kr. **הוא**]. Which does **עָמַל** mean—‘difficulty,’ or ‘misery,’ or ‘perniciousness’? Experience warns us to expect that partly accident, partly editorial regard for edification, has transformed the text, not however so far as to destroy the traces of the original text. Read probably,—

**וְתִאֲחַזֵּנִי תִרְעָלָה  
בְּעֵזִי יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**

31 f. **יִתְחַמֵּץ** ‘was embittered’?? G *ηὺφράνθη* = **וְשִׂמַּח**; but Syro-Hex., Compl., Ald. read *ἐξεκαύθη*, Vg. ‘*inflammatum est*,’ *i.e.* **יִתְחַמֵּם**. (cp. xxxix. 4). Possibly the text had **יִתְחַמֵּ**, which could be explained

either as יתחמם or as יתחמץ. But neither will suit. Read יתמה or אַתמה (Hab. i. 5), out of which came G's reading?—M אַשְׁתִּינֵן 'pungerer'? Read either אַשְׁתִּינֵם or יִשְׁתִּינֵמו (Gr.). See cxliii. 4.

33 f. Corrupt but not 'desperate' (Kau.). (1) Del. gives the sense as follows,—'For such persons (*i.e.* those who uttered the words of *vv.* 11—14) doubt has become the passage to apostacy.' But the poet has won quite a different solution of the enigma of human lots. 'If I had ventured on such reasoning,' he thinks, 'I should have broken the covenant and given up the fellowship of God's children; I should consequently have lost the blessings which they enjoy.' But the mode of expressing this ascribed to the psalmist is very unnatural. (2) Hitzig explains, 'If I had attempted to realize the entire amount of these chastisements (*v.* 14) by counting up the separate instances, I should have been overpowered, and been driven into apostacy.' (3) König (ii. 250) takes כְּמוֹ to be an adverb (G *oŭros*; J *sic*). (4) Following S T, and perhaps A Θ (*τοιαῦτα*), Bö., Gr. read כְּמוֹהֶם. (5) Ew., We., after Saad., כְּמוֹ הִנֵּה. (6) Klost., כְּמוֹהֶם. (7) Bā., however, takes the first step towards a true comprehension of the passage. He omits אֵם in אֵם־אִמְרָתִי (אֵם written at the end of a line to fill up a gap, and then mistaken for an independent word), and would adopt either Klost.'s כְּמוֹהֶם or כְּמוֹ הִנֵּה. He also denies that *v.* 15b is a hypothetical clause. This gives the sense, 'I said, "Such [facts opposed to a belief in the divine justice] will I count up; yea, I have broken faith to the generation of thy sons."' But surely 'such will I count up' and 'broken faith to the generation' &c. cannot be right. A radical and yet not arbitrary treatment is absolutely necessary. We. omits אִמְרָתִי (an expansion of אֵם); plausibly no doubt, but how are the remaining difficulties to be got over? WF's translation, even in the light of the note, is impossible. Gr. suggests אִדְבָּרָה for אִסְפָּרָה, הִדֵּר פָּנֶיךָ for בִּנְיָן בְּנִיךָ, and בְּחִדְתִּי for בְּגִדְתִּי; Perles (*Anal.* 41), חֲכָמָה for חֲכָמָה. כְּמוֹ הִנֵּה. Of these suggestions the two latter are the only useful ones. אִדְבָּרָה is not very near אִסְפָּרָה, and the phrase 'I denied the glory of thy face' is unparalleled. Let us keep before us Bā.'s view of the construction of *v.* 15, and the correction, already made, of *v.* 11a (*l.* 21), and we shall probably read thus,—

אֲנִי מֵאִסְתִּי חֲכָמָה  
חֲסִידְךָ וְאַמְתְּךָ בְּחִדְתִּי

35. M ואני־בער. However we interpret כִּי יֵת in *l.* 33, ואני is not what we expect. Probably it arose under the influence of ואני in *v.* 23 (M). G has καὶ ὁ ἐξουδενωμένος, *i.e.* וְאֲנִי נִבְיָה (cf. G, *v.* 20). Read probably וְנִבְעַרְתִּי (Jer. x. 14, 21; li. 17, Isa. xix. 11). This may have been written 'ונבער' נ would easily become expanded into אֲנִי. Cp. on xvii. 4b. '.

36. M בְּהֵכֹחַ הַיָּתִי, 'I passed into the category of "brutes," i.e. sank to their level' (Kön. *Synt.* § 264d). Unconvincing. It is an individual who speaks; why, then, the plural? We., בְּהֵכֹחַ; but this is arbitrary. Besides, it should be בְּבֵהֵכֹחַ (Job xviii. 3). Read תְּבִינֹת חֲסִרְתִּי (Gr.), and so obtain a perfect parallelism (see xcii. 7). The words became half effaced, and the scribe thought of xlix. 13, 21 (בְּהֵמוֹת).

37. M עֲדָאָבֹא אֶל־מִקְדָּש־יֵאֵל; G ἔως εἰσέλθω εἰς τὸ ἁγιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. But see exeg. note. Read עֲדָאֲשְׁכִּיל אֶל־מִשְׁפָּטִי אֵל drove out יל; כ became ב; ש became א.

39. M אֵיךְ בַּחֲלָקוֹת תִּשִּׁית לָמוֹ. G πλὴν διὰ τὰς δολιότητας ἔθου αὐτοῖς; אֵיךְ בַּחֲלָקוֹת תִּשִּׁית לָמוֹ is not recognized as the object. Reserve לָמוֹ, and read בַּלְהוֹת אֵיךְ (cp. Job xxvii. 20, and see on xxxv. 6). אֵיךְ, see l. 41; so S, Gr.

40. M הַפִּלְתָּם לְמִשְׁוִאוֹת. G ἐν τῷ ἐπαρθῆναι = לְמִשְׁוִאוֹת; see Bā., who, however, reads לְמִשְׁוִאוֹת (Zeph. i. 15, Job xxx. 3); so Klo., Now. Inadequate; why has the frequent occurrence of צִלְמוֹת in Job been forgotten? Read הַפִּלְתָּ צִלְמוֹת [עֲלֵיהֶם]; cp. lv. 5.

42. M מִן־בִּלְהוֹת, 'in consequence of calamities'? G διὰ τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν = מִן־עוֹלָתָם. The true reading is נִבְלִים; cp. l. 5. הוֹת is editorial.

43 f. M בַּחֲלוֹם־וּמִדְּקִיץ אֲדָנִי (we disregard Athnah). The first suspicious word is מִדְּקִיץ. G ἐξεγερμένους = מִקִּיץ (so S & J); the next אֲדָנִי (Budde אֲיִנִּים). But the whole of v. 20 is uncertain; how can בעִיר | צִלְמֵם תְּבוֹה (note Pasek) be right? צִלְמֵם ought to be a class-name or ethnic, and כַּחֲלוֹם ought to be parallel to it. Similarly, אֲדָנִי ought to be a verb corresponding to תְּבוֹה (or rather the verb out of which 'ת' has sprung). We have a right to presume ethnic references, and experience elsewhere permits no doubt as to the particular references. Read—

יִרְחֹמָאֵל וְכִישָׁם נִדְמו  
עָרַב וְיִשְׁמַעְאֵל תִּסְפָּה

For צִלְם = יִשְׁמַעְאֵל, cp. Am. v. 26, Ezek. xxiii. 14.

45. M עָמַד. But a verb is wanted (cp. xvi. 8); xvi. 9 suggests אֲשַׁמֵּחַ.

48. M וְאַחֵר כְּבוֹד תִּקְחֵנִי. To render 'thou wilt lead me to (the goal of) glory' (Zech. ii. 12) is impossible, and to assume with König (§ 319mβ) the double influence of ב is unnatural. Moreover, if כְּבוֹד



meant the divine glory, a suffix was desirable, and to avoid misunderstanding כבוד should have followed תקחני. Besides, the idea of entrance into God's glory would have needed amplification; it is hazardous to assume in the poet a sudden flash of intuition. Gr., We. (but cp. *Skizzen*, vi. 79) emend into בִּידֵי תִקְחֵנִי. But 'fetched thee after me with the hand' is tautological. The key to the passage is xvi. 11 (cp. note on *l.* 45); the true reading must be וְאַרְחֵ כְבוֹד תִּדְעֵנִי. ד and ק, ע and ח confounded. So *Jew. Rel. Life* ('98), p. 240. Beer's suggestion (*ZATW*, xxi. [1901], 77 f.), וְאַרְחֵ חַיִּים תַּעֲלִיחֵנִי, confirms the first part of this, but תַּעֲ is clearly no improvement. G neglects אחר—καὶ μετὰ δούλης προσελάβον με.

49 f. מִי־לִי בִשְׁמַיִם; an obscure and imperfect line. Bruston יִלִּי; Gr. וְעַמֶּד לֹא־חִפְצָתִי (lxxxix. 7).—M יִלִּי. Read 'ידמה] ליהודה בש' אֵלֵי לִי. וְעַמֶּד is not natural. Read probably בְּאֶרֶץ בְּאֶרֶץ.

51 f. Read פֶּלֶה לוֹ (cp. lxxxiv. 2); also צוּרִי, omitting the second שארִי, which arose out of a mental confusion between צוּרִי and שֹׂאֲרֵי. Omit אֱלֹהִים as a rival reading to לעוֹלָם (a not unfrequent phenomenon).

53 f. M רַחֲמֶיךָ. Read certainly מְחַרְפֵּיךָ; the Jerahmeelites and their abettors are meant. Gr. מְרַחֲקֶיךָ.—M פֶּלֶזְזוֹנָה מִמֶּךָ; very harsh. Read מִנְאִין שְׂכִיד (lxxiv. 18).

55 f. M קִרְבַּת אֱלֹהִים; vague. G τὸ προσκολλᾶσθαι = דְּבַקָּה (Herz). Read לִי־שׁוֹב שְׁתִּי, באֲדָנִי יְהוָה; note Pasek.—M בְּמַחֲתִי שׁוֹב שְׁתִּי. is a fragment of אֱלֹהִים (dittogr.). טוב שְׁתִּי comes from שְׁתִּי. Close the line with יְהוָה. לסַפֵּר וְנֹנִי is an arbitrary amplification. For מְלֹאכֶתֶיךָ read certainly נְפִלְאוֹתֶיךָ (xcvi. 3).

## PSALM LXXIV.—I.

**T**ETRAMETERS. The first part of this composite psalm is parallel to xlv. (2), lxxix., lxxxiii., lxxxix., and Isa lxiii. 15—lxiv. 11. The psalmist throws himself back in imagination to the time of the N. Arabian invasion, when Jerusalem and even the temple were destroyed. He hears the Mišrites and Jerahmeelites raising shouts of triumph on the sacred site, blaspheming the name of Yahwe, and singing praises to their own idol-god. Deeds of violence are being committed throughout the land, and it seems as if Israel (personified) were about to become a prey to ravening lions. *Quousque, Domine?*

The psalm has been variously assigned to the Chaldean period ('everlasting ruins,' *v.* 3a; 'they set on fire thy sanctuary, *v.* 7a), and to the Syrian or Macabæan ('the synagogues,' *v.* 8; 'no more any prophet,' *v.* 9; 'blaspheme thy name, *v.* 10). It has been said that 'only a premature decision as to the history of the origin of the Canon makes it intelligible that so many commentators have here been able to close their eyes to the light of truth' (Olshausen, 1853); also that 'the date of Ps. lxxiv. (between 168 and 165 B.C.) is so plain that it is superfluous to count up the grounds over again' (Duhm, 1899). But the fact remains

that 1 Macc. iv. 38 only speaks of the gates of the sanctuary as having been burned (cp. 2 Macc. i. 8; viii. 33), and it must be pointed out that no critical theory can be relied upon which is not based on a thoroughly revised text. If, therefore, it is correct that the reference to synagogues in *v.* 9 depends on a questionable interpretation of a phrase which has been introduced by corruption, and that the reference to the cessation of prophecy in *v.* 9 occurs in an incorrect gloss on already corrupt words at the end of the same verse, also that, according to numerous parallels in other psalms, the true text of our psalm contains references to N. Arabian peoples as the enemies of the Jews, it follows that the current theories must be abandoned, and a new one devised, and that the hesitation of Delitzsch was more reasonable than the dogmatism of Olshausen. We may admit that the invaders spoken of were hostile to the religion as well as to the nationality of the Jews; and that we have no reason to suppose that the Babylonian warriors would even take the trouble to blaspheme the name of Yahwè, or to destroy consistently all his sanctuaries. But it was quite otherwise with the Jerahmeelites or Edomites, who are more than probably referred to in this psalm. As linguistic evidence of a late date note בְּשִׁילַי (*l.* 14).

We have already compared this psalm with Pss. xlv.<sup>(2)</sup> and lxxxix.<sup>(2)</sup> It is true, nothing is said in our psalm respecting the defeat of Jewish armies (cp. xlix. 11a, lxxxix. 44), but this omission in a psalm which was written long after the time professedly referred to need not be a stumbling-block. Besides, Ps. lxxiv.<sup>(1)</sup> may very possibly be incomplete. Certainly the mention in *l.* 8 of the Jerahmeelites, the Arabians, and the Cushites as the wicked neighbours who lay waste the land of the Jews reminds us forcibly of 2 K. xxiv. 2 (see *Crit. Bib.*), where the names of the enemies of the Jews near the close of the Jewish state are given as Cushites, Jerahmeelites, and Mišrites. That 'Mišrites' and 'Arabians' are virtually synonymous needs no showing (cp. *ll.* 21 f.). One may conjecture that Pss. lxxiv.<sup>(1)</sup> and lxxix. are about contemporary with Isa. lxiii. 15—lxiv. 11, and that all these works were originally designed as lamentations on the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. For parallelisms cp. Isa. lxiv. 11 f. with Ps. lxxiv. 7 and lxxix. 1; also Isa. lxiii. 15 with Ps. lxxiv., *l.* 29, and *vv.* 18 f. with Ps. lxxiv., *l.* 31. It also seems probable that all these works were edited and modified for liturgical purposes. Cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Isaiah, Book of,' § 21 (col. 2207).

*Deposited. Of Asaph.*

I

- I Wherefore, O Yahwè ! spurnest thou thy pious ones ?  
 + Wherefore+ smokes thine anger at the flock of thy tending ?  
 Remember the community which long ago thou didst  
     acquire, 2  
 [Thy people which] thou redeemedst as the tribe of thy  
     heritage ;  
 [(?) Pity the place which thou didst choose for thy  
     name, (?)]  
 The mountain of Zion whereon thou hast dwelt :  
 Hide thy poor from the wickedness of their neighbours, 3  
 Of those of Jerahmeel, Arabia, and Cush.  
 The Mišrites roar within thy sanctuary, 4  
 10 [They cry] in the midst of thy dwelling-place ;  
 (?) As on a festival-day the Jerahmeelites shout, 5  
 The Ashhurites praise their idol. (?)

- They have destroyed the gates, broken the bars, 6  
 Striking with two-edged axes ;  
 They have set on fire thy sanctuary, 7  
 They have thrown down and defiled the dwelling-place of  
 thy name.
- They have said in their heart, Come, let us extinguish them. 8  
 Let us sweep the name of Israel from the land.  
 Our palaces they have annihilated, 9  
 20 'And there is no longer among us any sanctuary.
- How long shall the Miṣrite insult, O Yahwè ? 10  
 +How long+ shall the Arabian blaspheme thy name ?  
 Wherefore drawest thou [back] thy hand 11  
 From the sword of [Rehoboth] and Jerahmeel.
- Ashḥur and Arabia insult thee, O Yahwè ! 18  
 Gebal and Ammon blaspheme thy name.  
 Deliver not to the lions the soul of thy loyal one, 19  
 The life of thy sufferers forget not perpetually.
- Look [and see from thy] mansion of glory ! 20  
 30 The land is full of the deeds of violence.  
 Let not the crushed one withdraw [from thee] disgraced ! 21  
 Let the sufferers and the poor praise thy name !
- [See my] disgrace, O Yahwè ! [from] the Arabians ; 22  
 Think how I am insulted by Kenaz and Gebal.<sup>2</sup>  
 Neglect not the sound of my cry, 23  
 Let the shriek of the sufferer present itself before thee !

1. זָנַח. See on xliii. 2.—2. Cp. Dt. xxix. 19, and see on lxxx. 5. Ps. xviii. 9 explains the figure.—4. Cp. Dt. iv. 20, Isa. lxiii. 17. On the text of Jer. x. 16. li. 19 see Giesebrecht, *Jer.*, p. 65.—6. *Thy poor*. So lxxxiii. 4 (corr. text); cp. xii. 6, lxix. 34, cxxxii. 15.—9. *Roar*. An expression for the battle-cry (Isa. v. 29, Jer. ii. 15). So in Lam. ii. 7, of the same foes as are referred to here, 'They have uttered their voice in the house of Yahwè as on a festival-day.' Cp. l. 11.—10. M's enigmatical reading \* has

caused much discussion. If the words, 'They set up their signs for signs,' suited the parallelism, it would be best to see in them a reference to consecrated symbols, such as abounded in all eastern religions and superstitions. Most, however, think of military standards (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Ensigns,' § 1). Jerome, 'posuerunt signa sua in tropæum'; Athanasius, τὰ καλούμενα παρὰ τοῖς στρατιώταις στήλια. Grätz at one time thought of statues; Duhm suggests 'signs of supremacy, heraldic arms, Greek inscriptions and the like.'

<sup>1</sup> There is no prophet any more.

<sup>2</sup> Jerahmeel.

All based on a mutilated and corrupt text. See crit. note. The 'signs' in *v.* 9 are equally fictitious.—13—15. See introd. The burning of the temple can only be proved for the Chaldean (and Jerahmeelite?) period; see 2 K. xxv. 9.—17 f. Cp. lxxxiii. 4.—19 f. See crit. note and cp. Lam. ii. 5, 7, also Isa. lxiv. 10 [11], where the 'precious things' spoken of may be traditional sacred spots both in and out of Jerusalem.—21 f., 25 f. Cp. xlii. 11, xlv. 17 (corr. text), also Isa. lii. 4 f., where, in the most probable text, the Jerahmeelites are spoken of as blaspheming the name of Yahwè (see *Crit. Bib.*).

23. Generally the complaint is that Yahwè hides his face (cp. xlv. 25). The conception here is bolder. The idea is that the sword of the Jerahmeelites is dealing such havoc that Yahwè draws back his hand in stupefaction. See Lam. ii. 3, and cp. Isa. li. 9.

25. **Ashhur**, &c. N. Arabian ethnics. See xlv. 17 (corr. text), lxxxiii. 8 f.—27. Cp. xxxv. 17 (corr. text), where (as here) נפש and חיה are parallel (cp. lxxviii. 50, cxliii. 3).—29. Cp. Isa. lxiii. 15, and see introd.—33 f. Cp. ll. 21 f., 25 f. *Kenaz*, as *v.* 17<sup>b</sup>.

*Critical Notes.* 1. M לִנְצָה. Parallelism and the analogy of xiii. 1 &c., require חֲסִידֶיךָ. Moreover זֶנַח without an accus. is improbable (cp. on xlv. 10).—4. Insert עִמָּךְ (parallelism and metre).—5. Insert something like רַחֵם מְקוֹם בְּחֶרֶת לְשִׁמְךָ (similarly Bi.). Two Pasesks in *v.* 2.—7. M הִרְיִמָּה פִּעְעִמֶיךָ לְמִשְׁאוֹת נֶצַח. 'Lift up thy steps (or, feet)' is intolerable. *G* ἡρῶσαι τὰς χεῖράς σου; Σ τὸ ὑψῶμα τῶν ποδῶν σου. Gr., מְהִרָּה פ'. All inadequate. The next phrase is equally suspicious. 'Everlasting ruins' would be חֲרֻבוֹת עוֹלָם. The nearest possible correction is הִסְתֵּר אֲבִיּוֹנֶיךָ מִרְשַׁעַת שְׂכָנֶיךָ (cp. on lxxxiii. 4).—8. The poverty of M's text should awaken suspicion. Read יִרְחַמְּאֵלִים וְעֲרֵבִים. *יְכוֹשִׁים*.—9. Read מְצָרִים for צִוְרִיךָ (vi. 8, xlii. 11), and מִקְדָּשֶׁיךָ (lxviii. 36) for מוֹעֵדֶיךָ 'thy meeting-place,' Kau.; 'thy assembly,' *BDB*; τῆς ἐορτῆς σου, *G*). מְעַדוֹ in Lam. ii. 6<sup>a</sup> should be corrected accordingly. T and many MSS, יִדְּ—.

10. M שָׁמוּ אוֹתָתָם אֵתוֹת (so probably *G*). Grimme appends יהודה, while Woods (*Hebraica*, 1887, p. 261) omits אֵתוֹת and יודע (*L.* 11) as interpolated from *v.* 9, where he takes עֲדֻמָּה to be also an interpolation. Herz reads שָׁמוּ אֵתֵיתָם אֵתוֹת, 'there they have placed their axes (?) as ensigns.' Read probably, בְּתוֹךְ מִשְׁכְּנֶתֶיךָ, [קָרְעוּ] בְּתוֹךְ מִשְׁכְּנֶתֶיךָ; *יְכוֹשִׁים* is represented in M by שָׁמוּ and אוֹתָתָם; אֵתוֹת by בְּתוֹךְ.

11 f. M may be grammatical, but is it translatable? מְבִיא, יוֹדֵעַ (why not מְבִיא?), לְמַעַלָּה, and בִּסְבָּךְ-עֵץ are all very suspicious. For יודע T has יִצְלִיף, whence Bā. and Herz יִרְעוּ 'they destroy;' Du. יִרְצֵעוּ (*Ex.* xxi. 6); Gr. יִרְעִי; Hal. יִרְעִי. For מְבִיא, *G* 'A Σ Θ S J imply כִּמְבִּיא or ב'. Comparing Lam. ii. 7<sup>b</sup> it is plausible to read יִרְעִי כִּיּוֹם מְעַד יִרְחַמְּאֵלִים. For *L.* 12 we may read עֲצָבָם שְׂבָחוּ עֲצָבָם.

**אֶשְׁחֹרֵם.** The letters of the first two words were mixed up, and corruption followed. In **קָרַד**, **ק** seems to have come from **ח**, **ד** from **ו**; **וּת** is dittographic (**וּעַת** follows).

13. Kt. **וּעַת**; K<sup>r</sup>. **וּעַתָּה** (so some MSS. and edd.). G (S), *ἐξέκοψαν* or (A\*) *διέκοψαν*. Probably G read **נָתַצוּ**, which is right (so first Herz); the Greek verb had to suit *ἀξίναϊς*.—M **פִּתְחִיהָ**. G S **פִּתְחִיהָ**; so Rashi, Gr. But the suffix is unaccountable (see De Jong, 15). Read **פִּתְחִים**.—M **יַחַד בְּכִשִּׁיל**. **כִּשִּׁיל** is a not very common Aramaic word (plur. in T; see next note). Read **בְּרִיחִים שִׁבְרוּ** (Lam. ii. 8). Sense and metre gain.

14 f. M **וּכִלְפֹת**. An unproved word. New Heb. **כּוּלֶּה** = 'a plane;' **כּוּלֶּב**, T, 1 S. iii. 20 = Heb. **קָרַד**. T here has **מִיפְסֶלֶת דִּיוֹסְמֶר** (with) a double-edged cutting instrument,' which points to **בַּעַל** or **פִּיפִיּוֹת** (Isa. xli. 15; cp. Ps. cxlix. 6). So first Herz. To this, however, we must prefix **בְּקָרַדִּם**. **בְּ** fell out owing to **כִּשִּׁיל** which preceded it; **כִּשִּׁיל** in T Jer. xlv. 22 corresponds to Heb. **קָרַד** (plural).—Read **יָךְ** with some MSS. and edd. (l. 9).

17. M **נִינִם יַחַד** (cp. G T; absurdly wrong; but cp. Kön. i. 580). G *ἡ συγγένεια αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, δεῦτε*, i.e. **נִינִם לָכֹו**. No doubt this is partly correct. **לָכֹו** in M has become **כָּל־**. After **לָכֹו** we expect some verb, 1 plur. imperf. with suffix. Gr. reads **נִצִּיתִם**; Brüll, **נִצִּיתִם**; Herz, **נִעֲנִם**. But the critics have not seen that **יַחַד** is a misplaced part of the verb, so that we *must* read **נִכְחִידִם** [1]. We find the same phrase 'נִכְחִידִם' in lxxxiii. 5.

18. M **שָׂרְפוּ כָּל־מוֹעֲדֵי־אֵל בְּאֶרֶץ**. G (S) *καταπύσωμεν τὰς ἐορτὰς Κυρίου ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς*, i.e. **נִשְׁבִּית כָּל־מוֹעֲדֵי־אֵל בְּאֶרֶץ**; in S (?) too read *καταπύσωμεν* for *κατακαύσωμεν*, cp. the same error in G 2 K. xxiii. 5, 11. That **נִשְׁ** and **מֶאֶרֶץ** are correct, is plain; parallelism requires this. But what are the **מוֹעֲדֵי־אֵל**, which both M and G adopt? According to most, the synagogues ('A S, Del., Bii., We., Du. &c.). It is doubtful, however, whether synagogues could have been called **מוֹעֲדֵי־אֵל**. **בֵּית וַעַד מוֹעֲדֵי־אֵל** (Sota ix. 15) is a synonym for **בֵּית כְּנֶסֶת**, which cannot mean 'God's meeting-place'; indeed T gives **בֵּית הָעָם** for the **בֵּית הָעָם** of M, Jer. xxxix. 8. One might plausibly suggest **מִקְדָּשֵׁי־אֵל** (cp. l. 9), but having regard to lxxxiii. 5 we should most probably read **שָׂם יִשְׂרָאֵל**. The enemy's ultimate object was to destroy, not Israel's sanctuaries, but Israel itself. 'Observe that **נִשְׁבִּית** in **נִשְׁבִּית** was corrupted into **שָׂרְפוּ**;

ישראל became עדיאל שם; כל (see above) comes from לכי.

19. M אתותינו, i.e. 'signa cultus Mosaici, furore fanatico deleta' (De Jong, 20). Most improbable. Remembering Lam. ii. 5, 7, read certainly אֶרְמֹנֵינוּ. 'אר is very often corrupted, both in the Psalms and elsewhere.—M לאֶרְאִינוּ. Here נו is dittographic. בָּלְעוּ = לאראי (Lam. ii. 5).—M's אֵין עוֹד נְבִיא is a gloss on the following (partly mis-read) words.

20. M's עֲדֹמָה is dittographic; עֲדֹמָתִי follows. יודע, though supported by M's אֵין עוֹד נְבִיא (see on l. 19), is corrupt. Read certainly מְקֵדָשׁ (parallelism and context).

21 f. M צר. צר sometimes represents כָּצַר (see on lxxxiii. 8), sometimes מָצַרִי (xxvii. 2).—M אוֹיֵב. Read עֲרֵבִי (vii. 6, &c.).

23 f. Insert אָחֹר (Lam. ii. 3), with Bi. [so now Du.], for the metre.—M וּיְמִינֶךָ מְקַרֵּב חֹקֶךָ כָּלָה; Kr. חִיקֶךָ. The theory, presupposed by M, that יְמִינֶךָ is a rhetorical expansion of יָדְךָ, is superfluous (xliv. 4 is not parallel). It forms part of the material for l. 24, and Bickell naturally enough proposes the gentle correction, יוֹמִי בְּקֶרֶב חִיקֶךָ תִּכְלָה. The statement, however, is both ill expressed and superfluous. Similarly Street (1790), Duhm. As generally in this psalm, the corruption presumably lies deep. Starting from this, יָמִין at once suggests יִרְחַמְאֵל (אִישׁ יָמִינִי in 1 S. ix. 1 represents 'אִישׁ יָרַח', see *Crit. Bib.*). Remembering מִפְּנֵי אוֹיֵב in Lam. ii. 3, read probably יִרְחַמְאֵל [ ] מִחֶרֶב. The missing name may very well be רַחֲבֹת; רַחֲבֹת fell out after חֶרֶב. חֹקֶךָ (cp. חֲבֹקֶךָ) and כָּלָה both represent fragments of יִרְחַמְאֵל. For כָּלָה, Wellh. gives the impossible rendering 'draw forth,' while Derenbourg (*ZATW*, 1881, p. 333), Gr., and B. Jacob (*ZATW*, 1896, p. 131) read סָלָה. G has εἰς τέλος, which S' constantly gives for סָלָה.

25 f. Error lies, not only in זָכַר (Lag. בָּכַל), but in זָאת. G<sup>B</sup> gives a double rendering, ταύτης = זָאת (so א T), and ἧς κτίσεως (κτίσεως) σου = אֶחָדָה (Gu.). Both readings, and also זָכַר, arose out of אֶשְׁחָר; cp. the name אֶחָדָה, and לְהוֹכִיר in xxxviii. 1. אוֹיֵב should be וְעָרֵב; 'ועם should be גָּבַל וְעָבֹן (lxxxiii. 8). The change of meaning is certainly great, but the present text is very unsatisfactory. For חֶרֶף read חֶרְפוֹךָ.

27. M לְחַיִּית. G J, De Jong, We., Du. לְחַיִּית; Bā. לְחַיִּית (old fem. ending); Lag. לְחַיִּית־שֵׁן (cp. T, and Sirach, xxxix. 30, Heb.); Street (1790), Schrader, Gr. לְמִוֶּת; Kr. לְשַׁחַת; Grimme לְהוֹת. But xxxv. 17,

suggests לַפְּפִירִים; cp. on xxii. 21. חַיִּת is a mere slip.—M תּוֹרֶךְ, 'thy turtle-dove,' i.e. Israel. Unparalleled. Σ (Field), ἡ ἐδίδαξας τὸν νόμον, with an allusion to the תּוֹרָה (so T J)—a playful attempt to explain the inexplicable. G (S) ἐξομολογούμενην σοι = תּוֹרֶךְ; so Street, Gunkel; cp. vi. 6. Plausible, but not favoured by parallelism. We expect חֲסִידֶךָ; perhaps ס fell out, and חִידך became תּוֹרֶךְ.

29. M לְבֵרִית. 'The expression is strangely short, which beside the parallel member is not effective' (Ol.). The *bērit̃h* is supposed to be the pact between Yahwè and Israel. But this is here unsuitable. Bi., following G S, reads דָּ—(see next note). Hence Gu., לְבֵרִיתֶיךָ (cp. אֱלֹהֵי כָּל-בְּרִיּוֹת in Jewish liturgy<sup>1</sup>). Du., less happily, לְבֵרִית, 'auf die Gemästeten.' The best remedy is indicated by lxxxix. 40 (see crit. n.); בְּרִית comes from תַּפְאֶרֶת. Comparing the parallel passage, Isa. lxiii. 15, read הֵבִט וַיֵּאֱהָב מִזֶּבֶל תַּפְאֶרֶתְךָ. לְבֵרִית in ל is a fragment of מִזֶּבֶל. See next note.

30. Street (1790) was on the right track; מַחֲשָׁכִי (?) has got out of its place. So Herz. But the material in M G is too much for a tetrameter. Duhm carries up כִּי-מֵלֵא into the preceding line, which in M G is too short. But 'look on the fatted beasts, for they are full' is a detestable sense. Beyond reasonable doubt, as in lxxv. 13, lxxxiii. 13, נֶאֱמַר comes from מִשְׁכָּנֹת, and most probably מַחֲשָׁכִי has grown out of a miswritten מַעֲשֵׂי. מִשְׁכָּנֹת seems to be a scribe's conjectural variant to מַחֲשָׁכִי. Omit the initial כִּי or כ, which either represents or is a dittogram of the suffix in בְּרִיתךָ.

31. דָּךְ is certainly wrong. In ix. 10, x. 18 we read נִדְּכָה. But the corruption lies deeper. יֵשֶׁב after נָכַל is superfluous; the whole line is too vague and indefinite. We expect a closing reference to the temple and the N. Arabians, and this is confirmed by Isa. lxiii. 15-19—a passage which was certainly in the mind of the psalmist (see introd., *ad fin.*). Even M's text of Isa. lxiii. 18 will show this, but if we criticize this text at all keenly, the confirmation becomes still stronger. Read most probably as vv. 18, 19—

לְמַה יִּרְמָסוּ רַשְׁעִים מִשְׁכַּנְתֶּיךָ  
צָרֵינוּ בּוֹסְסוּ מִקְדָּשְׁךָ  
אֲדַנִּינוּ יִרְחַמְּאֵלִים לֹא-מִשְׁלַת בָּם  
לֹא-נִקְרָא שֵׁםְךָ עֲלֵיהֶם

Now that we have a clue, we can more safely proceed to apply critical methods. We may appropriately read l. 31 thus—אֲלֵי-יָבֵם מִקְדָּשְׁךָ—

<sup>1</sup> Cp. also Hillel's saying, 'Be of the disciples of Aaron . . . loving thy fellow-creatures' (הַבְּרִיּוֹת). Similarly Grimme, *Psalmenprobleme*, p. 77.

יִרְחֲמֵאל. Line 32 now acquires a fuller significance. When the house of praise has been delivered, Yahwè's worshippers will assemble for a solemn liturgical function of thanksgiving.

33. M קוֹמָה רִיבָה רִיבָה יִיבֶדֶד. קוֹמָה רִיבֶדֶד is strange; we expect רִיבִי. But רִיב and חֲרָפָה (L. 34) are not parallel words; nor is קוֹמָה parallel to זָכַר. For a key to the problem see xliii. 1 (crit. n.), where רִיבִי has grown out of עֲרָבִים. Read רִיבָה יִיבֶדֶד יְהוָה [רִאֵה] עֲרָבִים.

34. מִקְנֵי כָל־הַיּוֹם comes from יִרְחֲמֵאלִים (cp. on xlv. 23, liii. 2, lvi. 2, &c.), which is either a variant to or a gloss on מִנִּי־נֶבֶל, or rather מִקְנֵי וְנֶבֶל; see on *vv.* 17*b*, 18*b*. For חֲרָפָתָהּ we can now read הֲרָפָתָהּ; the final כ in M represents the ק in קָנָה. The context relates to the sufferings of the Jews; cp. xlv. 16, lxxxix. 51 (corr. texts).

35 f. First consider L. 36. M שָׁאוֹן קָמִיד עוֹלָה תָמִיד. An awkwardly expressed description of the uproar of Yahwè's foes. G presupposes [שׁוֹעֵת עָנִי]. נֶאֱדָת שְׁנָאִיד תַּעֲלֶה תָמִיד [אֶלֶּיךָ]. This has grown out of עָנִי עָלָה. עָלָה עָנִי became עָלָה. Editorial manipulation has evidently not been spared. It now becomes plain that צָרְרִיד in L. 35 has come out of צָעֲקָתִי; ד sprang from ק, רִי from ת.

## PSALM LXXIV.—2.

**T**ETRAMETERS. Probably a song of triumph over the recovery for Israel of the N. Arabian border-land, which is realized by faith as if it had taken place. Parallel passages are Ps. lxxxix.<sup>(1)</sup> and xc. The proœmium, which seems to have been lost, may have been parallel to lxxxix. 2—8, though, since lines 3—6 (cp. lxxxix. 10*f*.) are parallel to Isa. li. 9*b*, 10, there is just a possibility that the opening may have resembled Isa. li. 9*a*, and have contained an appeal against Israel's enemies. The reference to the dragon-myth (cp. Ps. viii., L. 2*f*.; Isa. li. 9*f*.) is an interesting proof of the tenacity of primitive myths. Wellh. in *SBOT* omitted *v.* 14 as an interpolation. In *Skizzen*, vi. 179, he restores it on the ground that it has no mythological reference. This, however, can hardly be maintained. Duhm comes to the same conclusion as the present writer; see also Gunkel (*Schöpfung*, pp. 42 *f*.).

- |   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | But [thou,] O Yahwè ! art my king from of old,                | 12 |
|   | That hast wrought deeds of succour in the midst of the earth. |    |
|   | It was thou that didst divide the sea by thy strength,        | 13 |
|   | That didst break the heads of the dragons on the waters ;     |    |



- Thou that didst shatter the heads of Leviathan, 14  
 And gavest up his carcase as food for the jackals ;  
 Thou that didst clear a way for fountain and stream, 15  
 Thou that madest to burst forth the rivers of Ethan.  
 Thine is Jerahmeel, thine also is Ishmael, 16  
 10 It was thou that didst establish Mišsur and Cusham ;  
 It was thou that didst fix all the bounds of the land ; 17  
 Kenaz and Rehob—thou didst form them.

1. **My king.** See on xliv. 5. *From of old*, for Israel's origin is traced back to the Creation.

2. **יְשׁוּעוֹת** 'deeds of succour'; cp. xliv. 5b. The Exodus may be referred to; cp. Ex. viii. 18[22], where Mišraim (Mišrim) is referred to as **בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ**, 'in the midst of the earth.'

3 ff. Cp. Isa. li. 9 f. *The sea . . . the waters*, i.e. the primæval ocean, of which the dragon Tiāmat was the mythic symbol. The dividing of the sea (cp. Gen. i. 6 f.) was the equivalent of the mythic dividing of Tiāmat. See *Enc. Bib.* 'Creation,' § 21. *The dragons*, i.e. the monsters which took the side of Tiāmat in the mythic war of creation.—*The heads of Leviathan*. A Babylonian tradition (a distant echo of which is traceable in Rev. xii. 3) gave twin heads to the mythic dragon. See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Dragon,' 'Leviathan.'—6. On the double representation of the punishment of Tiamat, 1. as consisting in her destruction, and 2. as consisting in her being placed in confinement in the ocean, i.e. the ocean which is coiled (**עֲקָלְתָּהּ**? Isa. xxvii. 1) round the earth, see *Enc. Bib.* as above.—7. *The rivers of Ethan*. Cp. GRT Hθαμ. It is here assumed that Ethan is the name of a region, viz. the Ethanite or Jerahmeelite country in the N. Arabian border-land where, according to the most plausible hypothesis, the Hebrew tradition placed the primæval Paradise with its rivers. That 'Ethanites' and 'Jerahmeelites' are the names of closely related peoples, if we should not rather say, that the Ethanites were 'bne Jerahmeel' (cp. 1 K. iv. 31 [v. 9], where 'Mahol' comes from Jerahmeel),

can hardly be disputed; for the evidence in favour of the rest of the hypothesis referred to, see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Paradise.' It is not impossible that **עֵדֶן**, 'Eden,' may be an artificial

modification of **אֵיתָן**, 'Ethan,' and that 'fountain' (**מַעֵיָן**) may refer to the fountain-head of the rivers of Paradise.<sup>1</sup> Gunkel's view is only superficially different. According to him, the 'perennial' rivers or streams are those of the primæval ocean (cp. xxiv. 2, **יָמִים**, 'ocean,' || הנָּהָרֹת 'rivers'; see *ad loc.*). For the streams of Paradise were originally the ocean-streams (see *Enc. Bib.* as above). The alternative renderings are 1. that supported recently by Gunkel and Duhm—'perennial rivers'; 2. that of J and EV—'mighty rivers'; both these presuppose that **אֵיתָן** is an attributive genitive (Ges.<sup>(26)</sup>, § 128, 2w). The first is the more plausible; the rendering 'mighty' for **אוֹתָן** is not to be supported by

Gen. xlix. 24, Jer. v. 15, Mic. vi. 2, since **אֵיתָן** in all these passages is open to grave suspicion. It should be noted, however, 1. that the three other passages of the P'salms quoted in Ges.<sup>(26)</sup> for the attributive genitive (lxxiii. 10, lxxviii. 49) are corrupt, and 2. that the occurrence of **תִּנְיָן** and **לִיְיָתָן** leads us

to expect some equally traditional word to define the nature of the rivers. It has often been held that by the 'rivers' the Jordan is meant (Del. and others). The dragon or Leviathan becomes Pharaoh, the fountain and river have to be explained by Ex. xvii., Num. xx. But the Jews knew by tradition of primæval divine acts, of which

<sup>1</sup> Possibly for **עַד** in Gen. ii. 6 we should read **עֵדֶן** 'fountain.' See, however, *Enc. Bib.*, 'Paradise,' § 5; *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*

the wonders of the Exodus (cp. on viii. 3) were but an echo or reflexion.

9–12. The lands with which ancient Israel was so often at war, and parts of which were so much venerated and indeed often occupied by Yahwè's people, belong to Israel's God, and owe

their delimitation to Him. Cp. lxxxix. 12, xcv. 5, in revised text.—*Bounds*, גְּבוּלוֹת, or perhaps 'territories' (cp. גְּבוּל, Gen. x. 19, &c.).—*Rehob*, another form of 'Rehoboth.' Cp. on lxxxvii. 4; also on lxxxix. 11.

*Critical Notes.* 1. Read אֶתְּהָ יְהוָה (Gu.) ; cp. *ll.* 3, 5, &c.—3. M פִּוְרֶרֶת (xxiv. 19, corrupt?). T גִּזְרֶתָּה, which seems right (cxxxvi. 13). G ἐκραταίωσας?—4 f. M רָאשֵׁי. G in *l.* 4 gives τὰς κεφαλὰς, which is at any rate necessary if we read תַּנִּינִים. In *l.* 5, G (B<sup>h</sup> mg inf R) has τὰς κεφαλὰς, but G (A T) τὴν κεφαλὴν, i.e. ראש, which, however, is unnecessary (see exeg. note).—6. Read probably גִּיתָנוּ גִּיתָנוּ. נו became גו; יתו fell out. Hence M's reading.—M לָעַם לְצִיִּים, on which cp. Kön., *Synt.*, p. 246, n. 1. On the vss. see Bāthgen, *JPrTh* 1882, *ad loc.* Duhm would omit either לָעַם (so already Bi.) or the following לְ. Hitz. and Wellh. emend לָעַם into לָעַם ('frass'??). Surely the right reading is clear. לָעַם and לְצִיִּים (לְשׁוּיִם) both represent fragments of לְשַׁעְלִים (lxiii. 11).

8. M. הוֹבִשֶׁת. 'What the writer has in his mind we do not know, but if he went about a little, he might become acquainted with dried-up river-beds.' So Duhm, more plausibly than Delitzsch and the earlier commentators, who see a reference to the drying up of the Jordan (Josh. iii. 14 ff., iv. 23). Parallelism, however, suggests the correction הִצְבֵּת.

9 f. For יום and לילה read probably יָמִן (= ירחמאל) and יִשְׁמְעָאל ; cp. lxxxix. 12, xcv. 5. Ordinary corruptions.—M מְאֹר וְשֶׁמֶשׁ. The Vss. differ widely. G<sup>B</sup> ἡλιον καὶ σελήνην. Probably an arbitrary alteration ; G<sup>B</sup> read, not שֶׁמֶשׁ וַיָּרֶחַ, but transposed 'מ and 'ש, and interpreted מְאֹר to mean 'the moon.' G<sup>A.C.E.T.</sup>, however, has φαῦσιν κ. ἡλιον (so Complut. Ald. Theodoret). 'A Σ φωστήρα [Syro-Hex., 'A φωστήρας, Field] κ. ἡλ. Θ φῶς, Ε' φῶτα κ. ἡλ. S' σελήνην κ. ἡλ. ; T סִהְרָא וּשְׁמֶשׁא ; S נִסְסִין וְנִסְסִין ; J *luminaria et solem*. Cp. also *l.* 23 of an African magic text, redacted by a Jewish hand, ὁρκίζω σε τὸν φωστήρα καὶ ἄστρα ἐν οὐρανῷ ποιήσαντα (Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 43 f.). But מְאֹר, though afterwards accepted as a term for the moon, cannot be right here, nor is it any gain to read סִהְרָא (cp. שְׁהִרֹנִים) with Gunkel, (1) because סִהְרָא was not in use in literary Hebrew, and (2) because mention of the heavenly luminaries is not to be expected here (see the context). The latter consideration is also adverse to the correction מְאֹרֹת שְׁמִים.

The context seems to require **מִצִּיר וְכֶשֶׁם**. **צ** became **א**, as in Isa. i. 13 (**און** from **צום**); for **כֶּשֶׁם** cp. lxxii. 5, cxxi. 6.

11 f. **גְּבִילוֹת**, *G τὰ ὅρια*, seems to be right. Gunkel proposes **גְּבִירוֹת**, a term for the constellations as influencing the seasons (cp. Job xxxviii. 33). But we should have expected **שָׁמַיִם** as the complement (cp. Mt. xxiv. 29). —M **קִיץ וְחֹרֶף**, a strange parallel to **גְּבִילוֹת הָאָרֶץ**, as Gunkel felt. Most probably ethnics lie concealed (cp. lxxxix. 13<sup>b</sup>). Read





